

Class 252N

Book SH64

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE. NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY

St Stephen's Church, Boston.

THE FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES.

LONDON : PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET



The Four Cardinal Virtues

The Four Cardinal Virtues

CONSIDERED IN RELATION TO THE PUBLIC
AND PRIVATE LIFE OF CATHOLICS.

SIX SERMONS FOR THE DAY.

WITH AN APPENDIX ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE
UNION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE, AND
ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN
ORATORY IN LONDON.

BY THE

REV. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A.

London:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1871.

COLL. THEO. SEMINARY

252 N
Sh 64

59766

WABO 601 100

TO
THE WEEKDAY CONGREGATION OF
S. Paul's,
WEST STREET, BRIGHTON,

TO WHOM A PORTION OF THEM WERE SPOKEN:

AND TO
THE SUNDAY CONGREGATION OF
S. Alban's the Martyr,
HOLBORN, LONDON,

WHO LISTENED TO THEM ALL;
TO WHOM,
IN THEIR RESPECTIVE CHURCHES,
THE FOUR LOWER OF
THE SEVEN EVER-BURNING LAMPS
MAY FITLY TYPIFY

The Four Cardinal Virtues,
THESE SERMONS,
PUBLISHED AT THEIR REQUEST,
ARE DEDICATED

A. M. D. G.

Contents.

	PAGE
<i>PREFACE</i>	xi
<i>ON THE NATURE AND OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CROSS</i> . . .	xlvi
<i>ANALYSIS OF THE FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES</i>	xlix

SERMON ONE.

INTRODUCTION.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
for she teacheth Temperance and Prudence, Justice
and Fortitude; which are such things as men can
have nothing more profitable in their life.

WISDOM, viii. 7. i

SERMON TWO.

FORTITUDE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
for she teacheth Fortitude.

WISDOM, viii. 7. 24

SERMON THREE.

PRUDENCE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
for she teacheth Prudence.

WISDOM, viii. 7. 51

SERMON FOUR.

JUSTICE.

PAGE

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
 for she teacheth Justice.

WISDOM, viii. 7. 79

SERMON FIVE.

TEMPERANCE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
 for she teacheth Temperance.

WISDOM, viii. 7. 108

SERMON SIX.

CONCLUSION.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues :
 for she teacheth Temperance and Prudence, Justice
 and Fortitude.

WISDOM, viii. 7. 140

Appendix I.

ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION
 BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE . . .

173

Appendix II.

ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ORA-
 TORY IN LONDON BY THE SOCIETY
 OF THE HOLY CROSS

205

Preface.

The contents of the present volume are so various in character that they severally require a few words of consideration in the Preface.

I. The plan for the Establishment of an Oratory in London, by the Society of the Holy Cross, is a plan which, in some shape, has taxed the thoughts of many minds during many past years. The question has been entertained, under certain conditions, by more than one Community. It has also been placed on record, in outline and in connection with another subject, in a recently printed work. But, so far as I am aware, the subject has never yet been publicly elaborated in detail, nor defended in principle. Neither has it been offered for general consideration with the features which distinguish the scheme set forth in an appendix to this volume. These features are mainly threefold. The Oratory of the future will be intended to play the part of a permanent mission to the upper classes of society. The Oratory will be wholly originated by, and in part worked through, the instrumentality of a Religious Brotherhood, whose private chapel it will form. And, in the first instance at the least, but in anticipation of better days, it will be independent of positive and direct Episcopal supervision.

Each of these three features possesses its own particular difficulties. But the real difficulties in the establishment of an Oratory are centred in the latter feature—difficulties in matters of principle, rather than in questions of detail.

Though some in themselves are serious, and others, at the outset, appear almost insurmountable, yet the legal, financial, personal, and local obstacles, with GOD'S help, may be surmounted. A principle, however, underlies all practical exertion, which must be resolved before any action can be taken towards the foundation of an Oratory. If this principle be granted, the developement of the plan is comparatively easy. If it be denied, the establishment, as stated in detail in the following pages, probably can never be, and certainly at the present time may not be, practically carried into effect. For the principle involves the interpretation of Episcopal jurisdiction, and necessitates on the part of the workers in the establishment of an Oratory a decision upon a question of mission, other than is generally held.

It may be affirmed that the question is one which cannot be summarily disposed of. Even those who disallow the position here advocated, admit that there is force in the arguments, and that the necessities of the case are powerful. Those who concur in the decision, freely own that much may be urged against the asserted liberty of action; and hold, that were we living in a less abnormal condition of ecclesiastical chaos, the idea would be intolerable. And here it may be said, that the proposal discussed in the appendix is made with singleness of purpose. It is not intended to suggest difficulties which have no reality, or to raise objections which ought not to exist, for the purpose of either explaining or withdrawing them. The objections and difficulties are not of our own origination. They are essential to the integrity of the plan discussed, not indeed abstractedly, but by reason of the circumstances and times in the midst of which we live. Of course a change to circumstances other than they find us, and of times different from those with which

we have to deal, would change the whole argument ; and the necessities of the case would consequently disappear. Meanwhile, I feel convinced that, until this much to be desired transition is consummated, we have ample authority both in the stern logic of facts, and in the principles of Church authority, to warrant the course of action suggested. But whether or not this may be allowed, it cannot be amiss to cause the subject to be canvassed ; and the discussion, at the least, will not fail to excite desires and to awaken hopes which may be expected to work out for themselves an answer either in harmony with, or independent of, the principles here enunciated.

The sermon, 'On the Limits of Episcopal Obedience,' which precedes the paper on the establishment of an Oratory in London, is intended to furnish an indirect support to the principle enunciated in the essay. From the form which this defence assumes, the argument could hardly supply more than suggestive materials to this end. But, however imperfectly the defence is made, it is not too much to say that the opinions expressed in the sermon are opinions both widely held, and held by persons of position, influence, and character. Under these circumstances, it were better that publicity should be afforded to such sentiments, rather than that they should remain suppressed and should gather strength from self-contemplation. For the expressed opinions have not hastily been formed. They are the growth of years, after years of observation, and in spite of strong prepossessions entirely at variance with results which appear to be unavoidable. Publicity, and consequent criticism, affords the only chance of mental rectification, if a mistake has been made. Publicity, followed by actual reparation, is the only antidote, if the impression be only too faithfully imbibed. In either case benefit will result, either to individuals, or to the

Church at large. But, pending this issue, it is perhaps well that these sentiments are felt, and these opinions have been arrived at by one who, personally, has never been brought into relations otherwise than friendly with any member of the Episcopal bench. It is certainly an advantage to the cause, that no private consideration need create any hesitation in the public expression of a judgment, however mistaken it may be thought, as honestly formed as it is openly avowed.

One fact upon which this sermon is based may be thus expressed :—The Episcopal mind, in the present day, is out of harmony with the mind of the Presbyterate. Of course I am only able to speak with reference to Priests of the Catholic Party. But in this case, the truth cannot be too strongly or nakedly stated. That the fact may be stated with any approach to truth, in regard to the Catholic School, of itself is noteworthy. Instinctive reverence for the Episcopate, and respect based upon principle, must have received a violent shock, ere the minds of those who know themselves to be Priests could cease to feel and act in sympathy with Bishops of the Church of GOD. Under any hypothesis, the anomaly is difficult to explain. Perhaps the blighting effects of Establishmentarianism, on both Bishops and Priests, may prove to be one cause. The curse of Erastianism, which is eating into the vitals of the Church of England, is fully sufficient, in the present unholy alliance between Church and State, to account for a divorce from each other of the two divisions of the order of the Priesthood. Those whose calling and duty it is, and whose pleasure it ought to be, to take sweet counsel together and to walk in the House of GOD as friends, have become alienated. And the intercourse of amicable conference has been exchanged for admonitions and judgments not always ‘godly;’ and, as a consequence, an

obedience and following which may be 'reverent,' but cannot be termed 'glad.' But, short of this absolute separation, the existing attitude of mutual suspicion and distrust on the part of both the Episcopate and Priesthood is irregular and painful.

Into the causes of this calamitous alienation between the higher and lower order of Priests, we need not examine beyond one, and that the most elementary, stage. Under whatever figure of speech we may call it, the Religious Movement which began upwards of forty years ago, and which yearly gains power and influence, has from the moment of its origination to the present hour been systematically, actively, ceaselessly opposed by the English Bishops. It has been begun, continued, and carried on solely by English Priests. For a long series of years, therefore, and under more than a single generation of Bishops, the Priesthood of the Catholic party has worked in an atmosphere of antagonism to its superior officers in the Church. We will not pause to divide and apportion the responsibility in this antagonism. Perhaps independence has been too much developed on one side. Certainly absolutism has been largely cultivated on the other. But the fact of divergence is historical. The Bishops apparently sided with the State against the Church. The Priests have been forced to choose between GOD and man. Hence, on the one side, has been evoked what seems to be lawlessness, but, in truth, is obedience to a higher law than Acts of Parliament : on the other side, a spirit of despotism has resulted, which has degenerated at times into tyranny, at times into helpless inefficiency.

One capital error has been committed by our spiritual rulers. They have failed to realise and accept the fact that two essentially different theories of Divine Worship exist at the present time in the English Church. They

have attempted, by enforcing a hollow uniformity, to evolve a single type of service, which fully satisfies neither, from these hostile theories. Such a course has signally failed in its design. It can never succeed in any country not entirely Catholic. It can never succeed in a free country situated as our own. And for this reason, that the diversities which exist lie deeper in human nature than can be reached by the secular arm of the State, the arm alone used by the Episcopate to stay the advance of the Movement. The subjective and objective theories and forms of worship will survive in their differences the Act of Uniformity: and if legislation has to be called into play to regulate such differences, our statesmen must legislate for normal and assured variation in the place of illegal and unnatural uniformity. Of the subjective form of Divine Worship, its popularity with, and adoption by, the many should be an argument with them for a similar, even if an opposite exercise of the freedom of private judgment in favour of Divine Worship which is not subjective in character. But worship which is objective stands upon firmer ground than that of private judgment; and though it cannot claim the convincing, and oftentimes profitable, argument of popularity, it is difficult to prove that its sources are not inherent in the soul of man, and that its sanctions are not to be found in Holy Scripture, in primitive antiquity, and in the constitution of Ecclesiastical England, 'as this Church and Realm hath received the same.'

The objective form of Worship, through the medium of the Sacraments, is emphatically the central working power of the Catholic Revival. Opposition to such development appears to be the sole object of some, as it is the main object of many, Bishops to organise. The success of the Episcopal efforts is not to be measured by the

number or the fewness of the churches which have adopted the very highest form of ritual developement, but by the general and widespread elevation in this point of the whole Church of CHRIST in this land. The multitude of churches which have adopted a character of service that falls short of the highest type far less than it surpasses the lowest type, is simply without number. And in the next generation the relative proportion of the two will be exaggerated. For, as a rule, no church is now built, and few churches are now restored, without being restored and built upon true ecclesiastical principles. It is true that the present incumbents may use their new or renovated edifices in an un-Catholic manner. But in the event of a Catholic successor—an event which time will ensure—a church with every appliance for a Catholic rendering of Holy Mysteries is ready for the fresh incumbent's immediate use.

The conspicuous want of success which has attended Episcopal hindrance to the Catholic Revival has certainly postponed, but has not at all removed, the prospect of impending schism. That a schism would be an untold evil to the Church is obvious; and its results cannot be anticipated. That the present state of abnormal antagonism in any Christian sense is less harmful, it is hard to believe. Both are or would be calamitous; and it is useless to balance their respective claims to superiority in guilt. It will be well for the Bishops, it will be well for the Church, if the errors, the effects of which we still feel, committed by authority in the case of the Wesleyans, may be avoided now. In the present case, however, the Episcopal Bench have not the excuse of the absence of experience. If they precipitate a schism, either by actively hostile legislation, or by unconstitutional illegality, or by the continuance of vexatious antagonism, the sin of

schism will rest upon their individual consciences. Neither those who see below the surface from without, nor those within who can feel the pulse of the Catholic Party, and know its deepest sentiments, need to be told that the scandal of Episcopal sanction of and apology for the desecration of the Blessed Sacrament in Westminster Abbey—and the dishonour done to GOD'S Holy Word by entrusting the revision of the Authorised Version to heretics and schismatics, out of which the scandal arose—has done more to render such a schism possible than any other act of the English Bishops during the last half-century. And there are Bishops upon the Bench, and they not the most Catholic in sentiment, who are far-seeing enough to acknowledge this position.

Now what may be done to render this possibility, humanly speaking, impossible? It is not for long that anything need be attempted. Many years, in all likelihood, cannot pass, before the mighty fabric of the Church of England as by law established will become disunited from a power whence it derives many elements alike of its weakness and of its strength. Disestablishment will throw the Church of CHRIST once again upon its own resources, and she will take up a position not indeed identical with, but to a certain degree resembling, her position in primitive times. Then she will be absolutely free to adapt her worship to her increased requirements. What I plead for at present is authoritative relaxation to this extent, that she may be free to do that partially and now, which she will be enabled to do completely hereafter. Of course the difficulties besetting such license for liberty are enormous. But they are not so overpowering that the effort for relief may not be made. The Bishops have only to acknowledge the truth before enunciated, that two forms of worship divide the religious life of England, have only

to allow impartially the developement of either, to begin the work of regeneration. And as a practical means to this end, if I may be allowed to suggest it, without at all seeking to raise the importance of the step beyond its proper level, the Bishops may be asked, if not definitely to sanction, yet, at least, not definitely to oppose the establishment of an Oratory in London by the Society of the Holy Cross.

Considerable opposition may be fairly anticipated to await the publication of this idea, not only from what it may be supposed to effect, but also from what it actually will perform. There is little doubt that the plan will be termed revolutionary and subversive of all order and discipline in the Church ; that it will be stated to be antagonistic to both the spirit and letter of the ancient Canons ; that it will be held to be too visionary for serious consideration. The last mode of argument is the least persuasive, and may be safely left unnoticed. The argument from Canon Law against the Oratory is more important and deserves attention. But persons that use it appear to forget that those who framed the early Canons, and those who were guided by them, and the times in which both existed, are different in position, character, and circumstances respectively from our own case. It is unreal, and hence inefficacious, to apply to a condition of modern society in England, where Catholic principles are not ignored, canonical decisions on matters of discipline, framed in early Christian times, let us say, in North Africa. Of course our aim should be to restore to the civilisation of this century the purity and faith of former times. But until this be effected, it is simply impossible to apply to our times, otherwise than by accommodation, the Canon Law of an age as different from the present age as light from darkness.

Neither may the charge, that the Oratory plan is subversive of Catholic order, be substantiated. And here I would recall exactly the position which the Oratory is intended to fill. The Oratory will become *the private Chapel of a Religious Society*, from which no Catholic will be forcibly excluded. And the emphasis is to be laid on the condition of privacy. The Oratory, being private in character, claims no territorial jurisdiction, invades no parochial organism, and clashes with no episcopal authority. Ecclesiastically, its position is unknown to the history of the Church, only because the Church of history has never been similarly situated to the Church of to-day, and hence has never originated an equivalent developement. Parochially, the Oratory trespasses on the preserves of no actual or vested interests. And towards the Bishops, until the peaceful illusion be roughly dispelled, the hypothesis of Episcopal countenance, support, and aid, tacitly given, or not formally denied, will be gratefully acted upon, will be thankfully believed. The private Oratory of a private Society may rightfully assert a title to such freedom of action, may justly claim immunity from being acted upon. And, with the characteristics of the times in which we live, the establishment of an Oratory may be declared to be in harmony with the temper, if not with the expressions, of ancient Canon Law.

To these arguments from principle I would fain add considerations from policy. I would venture to urge all who read these words with at the least not unsympathetic feelings, to be persuasive with others for the adoption of a measure of liberal policy towards the Catholic Party. The opposite method has been inexorably tried for nearly half a century, with how vast a failure let the present ecclesiastical condition of England declare. It is time that another plan should be tested, and that a policy of

toleration, which is all we expect, should be commenced. The excuses for a change of tactics would not be severely criticised ; and the reasons which caused the change would be eagerly accepted. Only let such a policy be adopted, and there can be no doubt of the result. Each party in the Church would then have free opportunity to take its own line of operations, and GOD would defend the right, and would cause the true to prosper. Nothing would be lost, and much would be gained by such a course. For if Catholic principles be not right, they will wither independently of human action, either hostile or friendly. If they be true, human impediments will not hinder them ; and those who strive to impede the course of the Catholic Revival may find themselves striving even against GOD.

The argument for the adoption of a liberal policy of non-interference with the Catholic Party has lately received a justification as cogent as it was unexpected. The Final Report of the Ritual Commissioners, appointed for the purpose of 'recommending alterations' in the Prayer Book to 'secure general uniformity of practice in those matters which may be deemed essential,' has been published. More conclusive evidence could not be produced of the impossibility, in the present condition of society, of arriving at any decision which would fulfil the object with which the Royal Commissioners were appointed. Instead of confining themselves to points 'which may be deemed essential,' the Commissioners have busied themselves with many details of the most supreme indifference. Instead of 'recommending alterations' 'to secure general uniformity of practice,' they have suggested alternatives which will perpetuate variations in the conduct of Divine Service. No doubt startling alterations are proposed with which we have nothing to say in this place. But the Commissioners have deliberately declined to deal with the key of the

whole position. The 'Ornaments Rubric' remains intact : and with this brief rubric on our side the defence of ritual developement, from a legal point of view, is complete. No further evidence is needed to prove the impregnable position of the Catholic Party in the Establishment as existing at the present moment. No evidence more conclusive could be imagined of the inability to resuscitate a mere conventional and insincere uniformity in public Worship. If this be so, we have a double claim to toleration—the claim of legal standing, and the claim of powerlessness on the part of our enemies to agree in any alteration of such standing. Under these circumstances, both common sense and common justice, both right and expediency, demand that a measure of toleration, to allow us unimpeded to reduce our principles to practice, should be accorded to the Catholic Party in the Church of England.

This is hardly the place to express any opinion upon the Report of the Ritual Commissioners. Yet the results, actual or possible, which have been attained, are so intimately connected with the establishment of an Oratory, that it is difficult to avoid forming a judgment upon the document. A conclusion more impotent in itself, and more utterly subversive of all that the popular mind had anticipated, can hardly be conceived. The First Report, by reason of the inconsequence of the conclusion from the premisses, was justly esteemed immoral. The Last Report, from the feeble minuteness of detail, the absence of principle, and the presence, to the limits of the Report itself, of almost co-extensive protest, forms a monument of official incompetence, and corporate imbecility, to which each member of the Commission individually and apart from the rest, would be ashamed to affix his signature. This moral and intellectual disgrace has been declined by two of the Commissioners—a Statesman, who acted with a

similar sense of duty towards himself and his principles in the House of Lords; and an Ecclesiastical Judge, who has proved himself above compromising his belief in the Truth at the bidding of popular prejudice. To these may be added another eminent member of the Commission, who saw no course consistent with credit but to tender his resignation. The moral and intellectual position of the other Commissioners are difficult to estimate. How any politician can reconcile with facts or expediency the conclusions arrived at, or how any Churchman can reconcile Catholic principles with results against which he protests—both having accepted and signed the same—it requires either the courage or the insensibility of a Royal Commissioner to explain. The opinion, in which many shared, that the Catholic cause had been betrayed by the First Report, if not confirmed, is amply avenged by the irrational and utterly frivolous decisions of the Final Report. Certainly the Catholic Revival has not much cause to fear from outward opposition, when these are the results attained by a Commission specially selected to place the Ritual of the Church on a level with popular intelligence and common sense. The Commission was summoned to curse the children of the Church. It has ended practically, though without design, in only not altogether blessing them.

The sermon, in the following pages, *On the Limits of Episcopal Obedience*, from the circumstances of the case, could only deal superficially with so deep a subject. The time at a preacher's command prevents his doing more than directing the attention of his hearers to certain points in such a subject. Had circumstances permitted, there are many collateral questions of which I should have wished to speak. To one such question I desire briefly to draw attention in this place. It appears to be a law in CHRIST'S Church from the very first, that in different

ages, and in different phases of its existence, different dispensations have been permitted to arise, to flourish, and then to fade away. Of course such dispensations, if they have taken definite form in the Church, are due to the Divine principle, which energises the Body of CHRIST, of Developement. A need has been felt which can only be supplied by the developement of existing agencies. The developement is perfected and the need is supplied. At a later stage in the Church's superhuman career, a fresh need is realised, and a fresh developement is required. And the later developement to a certain extent supersedes the former; whilst, in its turn, itself is superseded by a fresh inspiration from the living Principle of an ever-present Person in the Church, GOD the HOLY GHOST.

The forms into which these dispensations are developed are manifold. They are confined to no order in the Church, lay or clerical. They exert an influence greater or less in power, and for a longer or shorter duration. They either vanish away entirely, when their work is accomplished; or, reanimated, they assume fresh aspects, with either limited or extended powers of action. Some are confined to the Episcopate alone; some are influenced by Bishops and Priests alike; and some are carried on more or less completely by laity. One feature, however, characterises them all. To whatever extent the personality of the dispensation is essential to the existence of the Church, the manner in which the dispensation acts upon its age, and its circumstances, is of temporary necessity only. For instance—the Apostolic College, in its personality, and for a certain time and purpose, in GOD'S Providence, was essential to the origination and early growth of the Church. But, in the nature of things, it passed away; and, to a certain extent, the Episcopal Order took the place, and was developed out of the College of

the Sacred Twelve. Such is one dispensation to which reference has been made.

The times of persecution developed another dispensation in the Church. And, without much figure of speech, an order of Confessors and Martyrs was originated, an order which exercised wide influence in Christendom and obtained great powers, respectively, in their life and after their death. Presently, however, the need of the blood of Martyrs for the seed of the Church, and the witness of Confessors, as forming the fertilising principle of the Church, ceased ; and as a rule which allows of exception, the dispensation passed away and was succeeded by some other form of Divine inspiration.

Take other instances of what, though inadequately stated and inexactly defined, appears to point to a law of the Church Catholic. Take the case of the Fathers of the Church. A need was apparently experienced of a body of men, separated by time and space, of different nations and countries, of varied capacity and authority—yet one in this particular amongst others, the power of testifying to the doctrine of the Church in their own age, of handing down Catholic tradition from the past, and of handing on Catholic tradition to the future. If we consider the position which these ecclesiastical writers have occupied and still occupy in the Church, the reputation, value and extent of their labours, the importance of the work they have accomplished, and the range of their influence, we can hardly refuse to own that, in some sense, a dispensation was committed to the Fathers which they fulfilled, and which now, if still needed, is otherwise entrusted in the Church. A similar developement appears to exist in the case of the Schoolmen, when Catholic doctrine had become sufficiently diffused to need systematising ; and of the early and middle age Missioners, when the Faith

required to be propagated, and was propagated with a rapidity and to an extent of which history supplies no second example in later times. It is hardly an undue extension of the principle which is supposed to influence the Church, if we apply the term dispensation also to the meetings of Councils of national or provincial Churches, and especially of the Œcumenical Councils of the whole Church. The Monastic Orders also, whatever may be their future history, in the marvellous part they have played at the summit of their power in the career of the Church on earth, are clearly a developement in Christian practice and discipline, a developement which at various times has waxed and waned, and again seems destined partially to arise. Nor can the various forms of union between Church and State which the world has witnessed, be considered otherwise than dispensations which the Divine instinct of the Church has developed, actively, passively, or under circumstances which combine both.

If we admit the principle which apparently is at work in the Divine life of the Church on earth, the principle of developement in certain dispensations which have been enumerated, I venture to think that we may apply the same to yet another case. And here I would earnestly hope not to be misunderstood, nor to be made accountable, either by misapprehension or intentionally, for more than is affirmed. For the case to which I refer is one of much delicacy—the case involves the question of Episcopal authority and consequent Priestly obedience. And the principle which appears to me to be fermenting in the Church of England at the present day is this—that the power of originating, working out, and perfecting the restoration of the Catholic Faith in our country has passed from the Episcopate to the Presbyterate. To such an extent, and to such an extent only, may it be assumed that a dispen-

sation has been committed to the Priesthood at the present day, and that a developement in GOD'S Providence, has evolved for itself a result whereby Priests have been enabled to labour independently of Bishops. To assent to such a theory is not to do dishonour to the Episcopate. The theory is only the necessary induction from facts which are elsewhere stated ; nay further, it is the only explanation of the facts. It is more than possible, and it is much to be hoped, that the dispensation may be succeeded by, that the developement may itself be developed into, another which shall re-establish in the order of Grace the respective positions towards the Church of GOD of Bishops and Priests. Such a return, as it were, to first principles, is not unknown to the working of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT in either nations or Churches. Meanwhile, it is evident from the history of the Catholic Revival in England during almost half a century of work, that the Priesthood have had given to them influence and authority, and it may be added, success in wielding both for GOD'S glory, which they never previously possessed. For this bestowal of abnormal powers we not unnaturally demand a cause ; and the final cause can only be seen in the developement of a dispensation by the permissive Will of Almighty GOD.

There is little doubt that this explanation of facts which have happened and are happening before our eyes, will be misunderstood by some persons, and will be distorted by others. It may be well therefore to affirm that such an explanation is not caused by any un-Catholic sentiments towards the Episcopate. On the contrary, it is asserted in spite of the highest respect for the Office, and firmest belief in the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession. Such belief and respect, however, is compatible with holding to the theory that, according to the *nature*

of the Christian Ministry, there exists identity in *order* common to both the first and second ranks of the Ministry, Bishops and Priests, though there is difference in the *degree*. In support of this opinion there is a catena of authority in Christendom, which may be referred to in an accessible form in Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, and which includes many of the Apostolic Fathers, the chief of the later Fathers, and the most distinguished of the Schoolmen. And this opinion is confirmed by the fact that, for the ordinary work in the LORD'S Vineyard, a Bishop possesses no supernatural power which is not shared by a Priest. The sole Episcopal prerogative which a Priest cannot approach is the extraordinary power, in the Sacrament of Holy Order, of sending out fresh labourers for the work; for the Sacrament of Confirmation is administered in the East by the Priesthood, and is only confined to Bishops in the Western Church by ecclesiastical custom. It will therefore commend itself to many minds that the dispensation which has been spoken of is not, abstractedly, unreasonable, and is not, in any sense of the words, unloyal to Catholic principles. But whether or not we are prepared to accept this theory of the work of the Priesthood of the present day, we cannot deny that it forms a sufficient explanation of phenomena which all may witness, the restoration of Catholic doctrine, discipline, and worship amongst us, generally in opposition to, and always independent of, the Bishops of the English Church.

If any feel disposed to doubt the rightfulness of the view here taken of this question, they will have to account for the fact that the English Bishops have altogether stood aloof from the Catholic Revival; and that in spite of Episcopal indifference and opposition, the Movement has so marvellously prospered. No doubt secondary

causes have been at work to produce this result. But it seemed at once charitable and more respectful not to allude to these. It seemed a wiser plan, rather, to look for the causes of the changed estate of CHRIST'S Church in this land in the supernatural developement of a dispensation ordained and carried out by GOD Himself.

II. Upon the question of the Dissolution of the Union between Church and State it is not necessary to say much in this place. In the first and last sermons of the course, and in the first sermon in the appendix, an endeavour has been made to direct attention to certain features of the case which have not received the consideration which is their due. When the public conscience can be made to feel that the unwritten concordat of ages between the Temporalty and the Spirituality is violated in almost every particular in one direction, and is yet scrupulously and literally adhered to in another, the bonds of this one-sided contract will be broken. To educate the mind of England to recognise this point of justice appears to be one obligation of the Catholic School : and when the facts are realised, justice will be accorded, and the Church of CHRIST will again become free. With what conditions the freedom of the Church will be purchased need not at present, or in this place, be discussed. In the meantime, however, the Catholic Party may well concentrate its action to obtain for the Church, whilst still held in bondage, relaxation from State tyranny in these three particulars,

1. The election of Bishops in a manner less antagonistic to ancient precedent than the present custom ;

2. The reform of Convocation, and especially, as a first step to any change, the extension of the clerical franchise until, under certain conditions, every ordained Priest is

represented in the Assembly which is the Church by representation ;

3. The abolition of lay judgments in ecclesiastical causes.

Each of these three chains wherewith the English Church is bound might be unloosed without essentially altering the present relative position of Church and State. The relaxation would afford untold relief to the Church, yet without any injury to the State. The State would still retain the mastery which it has acquired over the Church, yet, within the limits of her trammels, the Church might become partially self-reformed. And it may be submitted to the consideration of the organism which perhaps slowly, yet surely, is extending its influence over the whole country—namely, the English Church Union—whether or not it might concentrate its somewhat desultory efforts in the coming session upon one or more of these points ; whether or not it might concentrate them, not that its action should end in a vague protest or resultless motion, but, through its one hundred and sixty branches in town and country, that it should originate a national agitation which eventually should make its will to become law.

Of these three points I shall only consider one, and that with brevity, the question of lay judgments in ecclesiastical causes. Since the sermon on the Dissolution of the Union between Church and State was written, judgment has been given in the Arches Court in the important Eucharistic case to which reference has there been made. Upon the Judgment itself, it is perhaps enough to affirm, what in effect has been elsewhere said, that the matter of the judicial decision could hardly have been better, and the manner of it could hardly have been worse. So far as dogma is involved, seldom has a lay judgment been so satisfactory ; so far as the defendant is concerned,

seldom, at least of late years, has the dignity of the bench been so compromised. The prosecuted ecclesiastic merely and silently declined to defend his cause before a tribunal, which as a matter of fact about which there can be no difference of opinion, is administered by a layman. This tacit disavowal of the claims of the Court is ungenerously magnified into, and it may be added, untruthfully stigmatised by the *Guardian* newspaper, evidently inspired by the tone of the Arches Judgment, as a *contemptuous* ignoring of authority. And apparently influenced also by the defendant's disregard of the claims of his Court, the Dean of Arches permitted himself to use language towards the absent Priest, which, when the heat of the moment was past, he should be the first to condemn on grounds both of self-respect and of judicial impartiality. At all events, those who are acquainted with the defendant, his position, attainments, and actual work in the Church of GOD, consider that the criticisms from the seat of judgment were those which ought not to have been made by a Judge of the eminence even of Sir Robert Phillimore upon a Priest to whom the Church owes so much and values so highly as Mr. Bennett.

But a far more important subject than a question of judicial taste, or the want of it, is at stake. And I take this opportunity to discuss the question, since the cause, upon which the hearts of many were anxiously set, has *not* been lost in the Arches Court. Had it been otherwise, a false motive might have been attributed to the course advocated to be taken in the future ; but no such motive can be imputed now. Sir Robert Phillimore complains that the defendant in the case did not appear 'before the court of his Metropolitan.' The Dean of Arches gave no reason wherefore the defendant did not appear; but he can hardly be ignorant of the reason. Without offering

any explanation on the part of Mr. Bennett for ignoring the authority of the Court, it may not be presumptuous to state why Catholics in general are unable to bow to its authority. And the reason is shortly this, because the Court of Arches is *not* what the Dean affirms it to be, the court of the Metropolitan, *pur et simple*, according to Catholic precedent. Mr. Bennett is the first Priest who has had courage given him to ignore the authority of the Court of Arches, and notwithstanding his legal contumacy his cause has been victorious. Apart from all considerations of success, and simply upon principle, few Catholic Clergy will again consent to plead before the court over which Sir Robert Phillimore so ably presides. For Catholics have two distinct and conscientious objections to the Court of Arches, 1. that it is not administered after ancient precedent ; 2. that it allows of an appeal from its decisions to a purely secular tribunal.

Let us take the last objection first. To affirm that the right of appeal is tyrannically imposed by Act of Parliament, and that the liberty to appeal cannot be denied by the Dean of Arches, is nothing to the point. It is doubtless as hateful to a Judge, presumably ecclesiastical, to be obliged to allow an appeal to a court secular as it is un-Christian in the eyes of a Catholic defendant to be forced to submit to it. But the fact that, under any contingencies, an appeal is permissible, in cases of doctrine or discipline, from a court Christian to a State court is the element which repels every Catholic who is not Erastian in his opinions on the present phase of the union between Church and State. This element affects the whole system, and poisons it. The position which I wish to affirm, and which I have never seen answered, save on the lowest Erastian grounds, may be thus stated :—A system of ecclesiastical appeals which finds its ultimate end in a

Court of Final Appeal that is entirely secular can in no sense of the word, or in any stage of its existence, be termed Ecclesiastical. It is comparable, in principle, to a slight but fundamental error, which influences the whole of an elaborate calculation. No amount of exactness in details can cancel the ever-present flaw in principle. So is it with the Court of Arches. The liberty of appeal from its decisions to the secular court of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is an incubus on, and taints, its whole course of action. And this liberty of appeal to Catholics is intolerable.

But the constitution of the Court of Arches itself, as it comes in contact with the Church at the present day, is open to serious objections from a Catholic point of view. It is not constituted according to ancient precedent. For instance, in the late charge of heresy, the Archbishop, as a matter of fact, did not sit in judgment in his own court. He did not personally hear, try, or decide the cause. I know not whether the judgment was delivered, but the witnesses certainly were not so much as cited, in his name. A layman, however learned and eminent, still a layman, at the present day summons the witnesses, a layman sits in the chair of justice, a layman hears the evidence, a layman adjudicates on the merits of the case, a layman pronounces judgment in the Court of Arches—a layman without any ecclesiastical assessor. Under such circumstances I ask, Can such a court, so administered, in any sense be called an Ecclesiastical court, before which a Catholic, with Catholic principles, could consent to plead? And apart from Catholic principles, on the principles of the Church of England, as by law established, is such a court so administered a lawfully constituted court? I ask in virtue of the ‘fundamental truth’ which Sir Robert Phillimore enunciated at the outset of his Judgment, that the

Church of England reformed herself on a primitive model. In the primitive Church, then, would a layman have been suffered to pronounce judicially, and in the name of the Church, or in behalf of a Metropolitan, upon one of the highest mysteries of the faith? Let those Catholics reply who support the present position of the union between Church and State. Late middle-age corruption *may* produce cases in which the Metropolitan delegated his authority to a layman. But taking the question upon the lowest grounds, and considering the Church as by law established, it cannot be said that we reformed ourselves upon any middle-age model. Certainly in early times so grave a scandal would not have been endured, had it been possible to be enacted. So gross a violation of all Catholic instinct could not have been perpetrated, even if it might have been endured. Why should Catholics tolerate the same in the nineteenth century?

Does any person on this subject require proofs of the sentiments of the early Church? History can supply many examples. Consider but two instances. 'It is a new and unheard-of impiety,' said S. Martin, Bishop of Tours, in the fourth age, to the Emperor Maximus—'It is a new and unheard-of impiety for a temporal judge to take cognisance of an ecclesiastical cause.' 'I trust my answer will prove satisfactory,' wrote S. Ambrose to the Emperor Valentinian. 'No one should call me contumacious (he proceeds), if I allege what your father, of blessed memory, not only sanctioned by word of mouth, but even by a law—That in cases of faith, or any ecclesiastical function, the judges should be both "competent by office and qualified by profession," thus the rescript runs; in other words, he would have Priests decide about Priests. And this extended even to the case of allegation of immorality. When was it ever heard, most gracious Sovereign, that in

a question of faith laymen should be judges of a Bishop? . . . Whether we turn to Scripture or history, who will venture to deny that in a question of faith, in a question, I say, of faith, it has ever been a Bishop's business to judge a Christian Emperor, and not the Emperor's to judge the Bishop?' (*The Church of the Fathers.*)

It need only be added that Catholics appear to overlook the gravity of the situation and the plainness of the issue. It is no question of a lay assessor to an Ecclesiastical Judge. It is a question of lay usurpation and of Ecclesiastical abdication. It is no question of preferring a Catholic-minded Judge to an Erastian or Latitudinarian Archbishop. It is a question of principle, which, even if the terms in working out the problem were reversed, would remain the same. It is no question of mere delegated authority. It is a question by whose authority such authority is delegated, and whether such delegated authority, under the circumstances of the case, is to us of any authority.*

It has been said that a layman, without any Ecclesiastical assessor, pronounces judgment in the Court of Arches. It is well known that in technical knowledge, and in subjects beyond the range of theology, secular courts are wont to consult professional experts when difficult questions arise. The manner in which the State guards its own rights in this matter, and the way in which the State takes care of the interests of the Church, ap-

* It may be well to state that no opinion is offered, and all inferences derogatory are deprecated, on the action in time past of Catholics who have either moved the Ecclesiastical Courts, or who have defended themselves in the same. Some at least of these would be the last to wish their conduct to be made a precedent, nor would it be reasonable to do so. It may be admitted that sufficient cause existed for their positive action, and that sufficient cause may be pleaded for our passive resistance.

peared in marked contrast in connection with the case lately tried in the court of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The contrast, from one point of view, is worth placing on record for the instruction of those who may be equally ignorant of the procedure of Church courts with the eyewitness of the following facts.

The case of *Sheppard v. Bennett* was to have come before the Court of Arches at a certain hour on a given day in the summer of the present year. On arriving at Westminster Hall a stranger would have experienced some difficulty to find the Court of Arches. But enquiry would have assured him that, could he discover the Admiralty Court, the object of his search might be attained. A Churchman might think it strange that the Metropolitcal court of the Province of Canterbury should be beholden to a secular court for the use of its accommodation. But this was a matter of detail, and the locality in which the Court of Arches took up its abode could scarcely affect its Ecclesiastical position. On gaining the Admiralty Court, the hypothetical stranger would have found that the time fixed for hearing the cause, *Sheppard v. Bennett*, had been postponed for upwards of an hour; and on further enquiry this reason would have been assigned, that the Admiralty business could not be concluded until such a time. This delay, again, might have appeared strange to the supposed Churchman. But here, too, he would have considered, that if the secular court confers obligation on a court Ecclesiastical, the latter must await the convenience of the former.

On the occasion in question, the stranger in the Admiralty Court would have observed on the left hand of the judge two ancient men, sitting apart from the court. And on once more asking a question from some civil official, he would have been informed that the persons

seated near to the Judge were two 'Masters of Trinity,' men trained to a sea-faring life, who acted as assessors to the Judge, and, upon reference, decided for him technical points of difficulty. Had the Churchman reflected on such a provision, he would have been struck with the practical and common-sense wisdom of the arrangement. During this interval, however, the trial was being brought to a close. The learned Judge had been hearing counsel, conferring with his assessors, examining evidence, comparing notes. The whole atmosphere of the Court, naturally, was redolent of nautical matters, nautical phrases, nautical ideas. The case was a case of collision in the river, and the details of position, speed, orders, steerage, measurements, and time were upon the lips of each speaker in turn. At last the Judge of the Admiralty Court pronounced his judgment, and the cause was finished. The Judge and his sea-faring assessors retired; counsel and witnesses withdrew; a few spectators indeed were left, but the court practically was cleared.

After a short interval another movement was observed. Fresh counsel entered. Solicitors and their clerks bustled about. Witnesses collected. Perhaps a dozen persons unconnected with the cause took their seats. And on the entry of the Judge the case of *Sheppard v. Bennett* was commenced. The hypothetical Churchman, had he been ignorant of the facts, would hardly have believed the evidence of his senses on the change which ensued. The court-house was the same, the hours were almost contemporaneous, the counsel were indeed different, and the witnesses were distinct, but the same learned Judge who left the court in a black gown soon returned in a scarlet gown, and the legal transformation was complete. The Admiralty Court by a change in the Judge's robes had become the Court of Arches. And the Judge

who had but lately listened to the scientific terms of practical seamanship was now called upon to decide upon the philosophic language of the deepest mysteries of the Catholic Religion. Yet would the English Churchman above mentioned have perceived one striking difference in the composition of the two courts, of the Admiralty and of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The forms of the Admiralty Court provide for the presence of two assessors to the Judge, learned both in the theory and practice of their profession. The Ecclesiastical authorities are neither themselves present, be the position never so grave, or the case never so important, nor do they provide priestly assessors to advise with the Court upon theological difficulties which necessarily arise, which require a lifetime of study and devotion to master, and which without such help, publicly or privately afforded to the Court, it is impossible for justice to be rendered. Once more might the supposititious Catholic have mentally compared the respective folly and wisdom of Church and State; might have admired the sagacious policy of the State in providing for its wants; might have deplored the suicidal indifference of the Church in neglecting its own interests, the welfare of its children, the honour of its GOD.

III. The Four Cardinal Virtues considered in their relation to the public and private life of Catholics contain the germ of the somewhat miscellaneous contents of the present volume. In so wide a subject it was only possible to touch, and to touch lightly, upon certain aspects of the Virtues which presented themselves for discussion. The reader, therefore, will not expect more than a superficial examination of questions which might severally be discussed at length in a treatise, but could only be spoken of suggestively in a sermon.

In the practical portion of the subject, an endeavour has been made to write of points with which, in every-day private life, ordinary persons come into contact, and which are not frequently preached on in public. Exception has been taken to passages in this part of two Sermons. In both cases an explanatory sentence has been added in order to prevent the danger of further misapprehension, and to make what was plain to the writer's mind plain also to that of the reader. Otherwise, the Sermons are printed, with occasional verbal alterations only, as they were written. In this portion of the book, an effort has been made to popularise and adapt to our present needs much of what was said of old of the Moral Virtues. This effort, so far as I am aware, has not hitherto been made—at least at the present day and in the English language. Indeed the Cardinal Virtues, though the basis of human action, appear to have been strangely neglected by modern authors. Even in Latin Catechisms of the Faith, or in meditations upon Christian Truths and Christian Duties, the rich heritage of our Roman brethren, which have been consulted for the present Sermons, little is said under this head; and that little is generally compressed into a single section, or, as in the admirable book of Bishop Challoner, into a consideration of three points for the meditation of one day. How far such an effort has been successful must be judged by those who study the form which the effort has taken. I will only add in self-defence, not to escape from criticism, but to account for defects, that the task has been no easy one, from the nature of the case and the little external help to be acquired, both to seize on salient points of daily life for consideration, and also to treat them practically and wisely when the selection has been made.

In the theoretical part of the work another effort has

been made, perhaps of more difficulty because the outward aids have been even less. This effort has resulted in an attempt to cast into a Christian mould, and to reproduce with popular features, certain portions of the Ethical System of Aristotle. This has been attempted in general terms and less methodically in the Sermons ; with more exactness and order, and analytically in the examination of the Virtues in detail which precedes them. Both the Sermons and the Analysis must speak for themselves. I would only draw attention to these few points :

1. That the examples in the employment of the Virtues are necessarily to an extent arbitrary. As human action is one but many-sided, it cannot fail that similar expressions of Moral Virtue spring from different sources. Hence, the same developement may appear as the result of different causes. Self-inspection will prove that such apparent, perhaps such actual, anomaly is essentially natural.

2. That prefixed to the Sermons is an Analysis of the Four Cardinal Virtues based upon certain features of the Aristotelian system viewed from a Christian standpoint. This Analysis does not pretend to be exhaustive, and considers the Moral Virtues in relation only to the Sermons which follow.

3. That before the Analysis is placed a selection of certain Abstract Propositions, taken in part from Aristotle's Ethics and in part from Catholic Theology, which may be useful in estimating the principles of holiness, and in perceiving how such principles may be reduced to practice in the concerns of ordinary, commonplace life. In the construction of this Analysis, as well as in the composition of the Sermons, I am glad to be able to direct the attention of others to a source to which I own much obligation, namely, to a translation of the Ethics, which is enriched by valuable notes and other original

matter, from the pen of the Rev. D. P. Chase (*Rivingtons*, 3rd Edition, 1865).

4. That the doctrine of the 'mean' or middle term of moral action, in the examination of the several Virtues, in the following pages, is treated simply as a theory, possibly a correct, certainly a useful theory for the elucidation of principle, and cultivation of sound practice. It is not in any degree to be considered a representation of absolute truth. Although it occupies a prominent place, it is not by any means one of the fundamental or strongest features even in Aristotle's system; and therefore, it would be unwise to lay upon the theory too great a weight in any Catholic system of Morality. Indeed, whilst in some cases a defence of the idea is not only possible, but may be made triumphantly, practical difficulties stand in the way of its developement upon either ante or post Christian principles. It contains, doubtless, a considerable element of truth, and possesses much practical merit for the analysis and cultivation of any given Virtue, but is liable to be extended too far in the hands of others, and, as a fact, has been extended too widely by its author.

One deeply interesting question, in connection with holiness of life, which has not been discussed in the following pages, is deserving of thought, and is suggested in this place as a subject for the consideration of others—I mean, the *differentia* between the Moral Virtues of Aristotle and the Cardinal Virtues of the Church. In what consists the difference between virtue in a heathen and godliness in a Christian? Is the *differentia* a difference in kind, or a difference in degree? Are these differences capable of being distinguished, and by what notes? Can a distinction be drawn from the origin of the act, or from its motive, or from its means, or from its result? To what

extent, and by what law, is, or is not, heathen holiness that which Christian godliness cannot be denied to be, meritorious? Is it sufficient, or does it fall short of the truth, to assert of the one, that it is uncovenantedly meritorious; and to say of the other, that it is meritorious from the nature of the case—by the union of the agent with the Sacred Manhood? Admitting that godliness in a Christian man is the joint product of these factors of grace, prevenient, furthering, and perfecting—whence comes the holiness of one who is not a Christian? May we affirm of the principle of supernatural action, as of the elements of Divine Faith outside the Church, that though lost to the human race to a very large extent, yet that GOD was never without a witness in the world in either sphere of truth, and that it still lingered amongst men, even before, in a complete and perfect sense, ‘grace and truth came by JESUS CHRIST?’

No doubt these questions, or some of them, may be answered positively, in an offhand manner. But they can also be discussed more worthily, and in the present condition of English society they demand careful consideration. Seldom, apart from the consequences of political agitation, has the World of the present day in this country been so completely at issue with the Church. Legislative enactments, political principles, scientific researches, the weakening of parental authority, the denial of sacramental grace as the result of the Incarnation by one party in the Church, and the advocacy of a bond of Christian union upon the principles of heathen morality by another party in the Church—such are some of the elements which tend to create this exceptional position of affairs. The questions above stated are of supreme importance in their replies in a state of society composed widely of persons absolutely external to the Church; of

those who practically have cast off the larger part, if not the whole, of their Christian obligations ; and of those who have been admitted, though in schism, by one Sacrament into the Church, but have not been reconciled to the Body of CHRIST. How are we to view the practical and benevolent works of such as these? Can we affirm of such works, that they are good? Are such works good works, to the extent of our being able, as Catholics, to join heartily in them? To these and similar questions I venture upon no reply. I only very strongly hold that they demand an answer. I earnestly hope that their enunciation may move some one, capable for the task, to supply a fitting response.

The photograph which serves for a frontispiece is a combination from four studies by Giotto in the celebrated chapel of Santa Maria dell' Arena, at Padua. The present photograph is reduced from larger photographs of the Four Cardinal Virtues, placed in the order in which they appear and surrounded by a border taken from other subjects in the same chapel. Of all the existing productions of Giotto, says the author of Murray's *Handbook to North Italy*, none are so perfect and genuine and so truly exemplify the character and beauties of his style. The chapel was painted in Giotto's youth whilst studying at Padua ; and during a portion of the time the works were under his hand, Dante was living with the painter ; so that it is not improbable that we have the reproduction of the minds of both friends in this labour. In this chapel, says a writer quoted by the same author, which may be deemed a perfect example of Italian Gothic Church painting, blue is substituted for the gold ground of the earlier painters. The figures are all on a ground

of plain blue, and are divided from each other by broad ornamental bands vertically and narrow bands horizontally. The figures in the photograph are thus shortly described—1. Fortitude : in ancient armour, the skin of a lion thrown over the armour. She rests tranquilly upon the shield, which she opposes to her enemies. 2. Prudence : sitting at a desk, and contemplating herself at a mirror. At the back of her head is the face of an old man, but apparently a mask, or part of her head-dress, and not a second face as in the tomb of San Pietro Martire, at Milan. 3. Justice : a crowned matron seated upon a throne, her countenance severe and thoughtful. The scales of the balance which she poises are even. In one an angel presents a laurel wreath to the good : in the other it is the destroyers wielding the sword for the punishment of the wicked. 4. Temperance : a female figure fully draped. She holds a sword, but it is bound into the scabbard : a bit is placed in her mouth, the emblem of restraint.

The pattern engraved for the cover is taken from an early Byzantine design.

In conclusion, I commend the Establishment of an Oratory in London by the Society of the Holy Cross to the consideration both of laymen, who would provide at once the means of working and the material to be worked upon ; and also to those in authority, who will have to decide what position they are prepared to take in reference to this subject. I commend the facts, and opinions based upon facts, illustrative of the present condition of the Union between Church and State to politicians of both parties, who desire to see justice afforded to all sides, and anomalies and inconsistencies to be suppressed.

I commend the study of the Four Cardinal Virtues to all who care not only to do good but to do right ; who wish not only to act rightly, but to act according to principle ; who seek not only to live by principle, but to learn the principle by which they ought to live. And I commend the whole to the greater glory of GOD.

ORBY SHIPLEY.

20, DENMARK TERRACE, BRIGHTON :

Michaelmas, A.D. 1870.

NOTE.

THE following Statement gives some account of the Society of which mention has been above made :

NATURE AND OBJECTS

OF THE

Society of the Holy Cross.

THIS Society has been founded for the primary purpose of deepening, by means of a definite Rule, the Spiritual Life in its Brethren. It is restricted to Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and *bonâ fide* candidates for Holy Orders. The originators of the Society were convinced that work for CHRIST in His Church could only be effectively done by those over whom the Spirit of His Own Life on Earth had gained some hold : and on the other hand, that this spirit can only retain its hold upon the character of a Priest when it finds its expression in vigorous action within the sphere of his calling.

Hence the features of the Society are twofold :

I. Its Interior Rule, acting upon the character ; and

II. Its Outward Work, leading the Brethren to take their position towards the world as possessors of a supernatural life and commission, which must either die out, or extend its influence to others.

I. Its Interior Rule is divided into Three Degrees—

1. The Green Rule, which is binding upon every Brother :

2. The Red Rule, with a stricter obligation : and

3. The White Rule, restricted to celibates, still more stringent in its requirements. Besides these, there is a Roll of Celibates, to which any Brother may belong, without binding himself to the obligations of the stricter Rules. No greater obligation than the Green Rule is required of any Brother, but all are encouraged to avail themselves (as they may be inwardly called) of the two stricter, or Voluntary Rules. Three Standards of Daily Life of increasing strictness, corresponding to the three Rules of the Society, have been drawn up, and recommended to the Brethren to be observed by them.

The Brethren are divided into those of the Lower Order, who have no vote in the affairs of the Society, but may speak in Synod or Chapter ; and those

of the Higher Order, who must be Priests, and are the governing body. A Priest is eligible for the Higher Order at the Chapter, after his admission to the Lower.

The Officers of the Society are, a Master, four Vicars, a Secretary, and Treasurer ; together with Local Vicars, Secretaries, and Treasurers in the country, all of whom are elected annually.

II. The External Work of the Society is directed to the defence and extension of Catholic Faith and Discipline. This it endeavours to effect by establishing and working in Home and Foreign Missions ; by conducting Retreats and Missions, issuing Tracts and other publications, and by frequent Meetings, and by Correspondence between Brethren and with others engaged in like work.

Brethren are also pledged to aid each other, both in spiritual and temporal matters.

The following is the

GREEN RULE.

1. Every Brother is to pray daily for the Church and Society ; using either the *Officium proprium*, or the three Collects in the Office.
2. When two Brethren meet, the elder is to salute the younger in the words *Pax tibi*, to which the younger shall reply, *Per Crucem*—except in the presence of strangers.
3. Every Brother is to attend all the Synods and Chapters of the Society he can, and positively the Synod on May the 3rd (Holy Cross Day), unless unavoidably detained ; in which case he shall communicate to the Master or Secretary.
4. Every Brother is to pay a Subscription of not less than 10s. a year.

Each Brother upon his admission to the Society is required to make the following promise :

'I, N or M, do hereby promise to carry out, as far as I can, the objects of the Society of the Holy Cross, and to keep the Rules of the Society ; also, that I shall be ready to render all brotherly aid, both in temporal and in spiritual things, to those with whom I am bound in this holy bond.'

He afterwards says the Nicene Creed.

STANDARD OF DAILY LIFE OF THE GREEN RULE.*

1. Rise not later than 7.30 a.m.
2. Commend the day to God at first waking, and the night at going to bed, by saying *Gloria Patri*, or some other form : and at rising and lying down, sign yourself with the sign of the Cross, saying, *In Nomine Patris*

* Rule No. 3 is omitted, as an alteration in its wording is in contemplation.

4. Observe the rule of the Church, to say Matins and Evensong daily, either publicly or privately.
5. Use a Preparation before, and a Thanksgiving after, Holy Communion.
6. Examine yourself daily.
7. Read daily a portion of Holy Scripture (on your knees, if possible), as God's Voice to you ; this may be blended with mental prayer, or with study.
8. Say daily a mid-day Office, which may be the Office of the Society ; and Compline, which may be family devotion.
9. Say Grace, at least privately, before and after every meal.

FOOD. 1. Use all food to repair the daily decays of nature, and not for self-indulgence.

2. Observe the days of fasting and abstinence appointed by the Church.

DRESS. Avoid unclerical attire.

RECREATION. Avoid all theatres, balls, and such other amusements as might prove an occasion of scandal.

STUDY. Gain, if possible, at least half-an-hour daily for study of Holy Scripture, or Theological reading.

SOCIETY. 1. Do not speak evil or disparagingly of any one, except as a distinct duty.

2. Avoid frivolous and unedifying conversation, especially in female society.

3. Never quote Holy Scripture, except for some religious or useful purpose.

Analysis

OF THE

FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES

IN RELATION TO THE FOLLOWING SERMONS.

ABSTRACT PROPOSITIONS.

I. Virtue.

Virtue is that quality of the soul which makes a man good, and makes him do good.

II. Elements of Holiness.

The three elements of holiness, by the use of which we may attain to sanctity in daily life, are

1. The light of Reason, by which we gain a knowledge of the principles of the Cardinal Virtues ;
2. Free-will, by which we make choice, whether to do, or not to do, that which reason teaches us of the action of the Cardinal Virtues ;
3. Sacramental Grace, by which we obtain power to act as reason dictates and free-will decides in the exercise of the Cardinal Virtues.

III. The Cardinal, or Moral Virtues.

The Moral or Cardinal Virtues are the four principal Virtues, which regulate the actions or 'manners' of men, as men, in the ordinary details of daily life.

IV. *The Exercise of the Cardinal Virtues.*

The practical exercise of the Cardinal Virtues is caused by, and results in, the conformity of the human will to the Will Divine.

V. *Conformity of Man's will to the Will of God.*

Conformity of man's will to the Will of GOD, by means of the Cardinal Virtues, may be acquired in three ways :—

1. In doing all that we ought to perform ;
2. In bearing all that we ought to endure ;
3. In acting as we are bound to act.

VI. *Reasons for seeking Conformity with God's Will.*

Three reasons for aspiring to conformity with the Divine Will :—

1. For the greater glory of GOD.
2. For our own salvation.
3. For the good of the souls of others

VII. *The Manner of exercising the Cardinal Virtues.*

The Cardinal Virtues may be exercised in three ways :—

1. Actively.
2. Passively.
3. In a manner which combines both.

VIII. *How Human Nature has a Capacity for exercising the Cardinal Virtues.*

By the extension of the Incarnation to each individual soul, through the means of the Sacraments, man is capable of exercising the Cardinal Virtues.

IX. *The Cultivation of the Cardinal Virtues is the Result of certain definite mental or physical conditions.*

The Cardinal Virtues, when exercised perfectly, must be considered to be

1. The result of a state of action, not merely a matter of feeling ; or
2. The issue of an energising custom, not only a faculty which may be exercised ; or
3. The product of habitual repetition, not simply the effort of a single act.

X. *The Constituent Parts of a perfect Act of Virtue.*

A perfect act of Virtue consists of three factors :—

1. The motive ;
2. The law or rule ;
3. The test.

XI. *The Motive of an Act of Virtue.*

The motive, which influences a perfect act of Virtue, is

The greater glory of GOD.

XII. *The Law or Rule of an Act of Virtue.*

The law or rule, which regulates a perfect act of Virtue, is

To avoid excess or defect, exaggeration or imperfection ; and to cultivate the ‘mean’ or middle term between these extremes.

XIII. *The Test of an Act of Virtue.*

The test, which proves the progress that has been made, or has yet to be made, towards a perfect act of Virtue, is

The pleasure or pain which each act of Virtue causes us, in and after its performance.

XIV. *Four Conditions of Perfection in an Act of Virtue.*

A perfect act of Virtue must be done

1. With a full knowledge of the deed ;
2. After free moral choice ;
3. Disinterestedly, and not selfishly ;
4. Upon principle, and not by haphazard.

XV. *Two Forms of Action.*

Action may assume two forms. It may either be

1. Involuntary, or
2. Voluntary.

XVI. *Involuntary Action.*

Involuntary action is done either

1. Upon compulsion ; or
2. Because of Ignorance.

XVII. *Involuntary Action done upon Compulsion.*

Compulsory action is of two kinds. It may be either

1. Physical ; in which case the will does not act ;
and for which men are not responsible ; or
2. Moral ; in which case the will acts, but not
freely ; and for which men are praised, excused,
or blamed, according to circumstances.

XVIII. *Involuntary Action done because of Ignorance.*

No responsibility attaches to involuntary action done because of ignorance, unless

1. The act is caused by our own fault ; or
2. The act is the result of 'judicial blindness ;' or
3. We feel no contrition when knowledge replaces
ignorance.

XIX. *Voluntary Action.*

Voluntary action may be defined to be, action which originates in the doer, who is conscious of the details of which the action consists.

XX. *Two Elements of Moral Choice.*

The two elements of moral choice are

1. Absolute freedom ; and
2. Deliberate consciousness.

XXI. *Freedom of Moral Choice.*

Absolute freedom of moral choice involves action

1. Towards an end ; and
2. With a will.

XXII. *Consciousness of Moral Choice.*

Deliberate consciousness of moral choice involves

1. Consideration as to the means, and
2. Choice of the means.

XXIII. *Four Elements of Moral Choice.*

Moral choice is a combination of

1. An end to be aimed at ;
2. Consideration as to the means ;
3. Choice of the means ;
4. A will to act upon.

Otherwise 1. we wish ; 2. we deliberate ; 3. we decide ; 4. we will.

XXIV. *Four Stages of a Moral Action or Act of Virtue.*

The four stages by which a deed rises from the level of a natural act to that of a supernatural action, are

1. Fortitude, which regulates the irascible appetite, so that it overcomes all difficulties ;
2. Prudence, which regulates the understanding, so that it becomes the guide of our actions ,

3. Justice, which governs the will, so as to make us give to every one his due ; and
4. Temperance, which governs the fleshly appetite, so as to make us indifferent to sensual pleasures.

XXV. *The Principles on which the Cardinal Virtues are based.*

The Cardinal Virtues depend upon two principles of action :—

1. Inward principles, as regards ourselves ;
2. Outward principles, as regards others.

XXVI. *The Inward Principles of Action.*

The inward principles of action, as regards ourselves, are twofold :—

1. Not to prefer a lesser good before a greater, *i.e.* to abstain from a lesser good in order to secure a greater :
2. Not to choose a greater harm before a lesser, *i.e.* to undergo a lesser harm in order to avoid a greater.

XXVII. *The Outward Principles of Action.*

The outward principles of action, as regards others, are twofold :—

1. To do right in all cases :
2. To do well all that is done.

XXVIII. *The Result of the Cardinal Virtues.*

The end which results from the exercise of the Four Cardinal Virtues is the cultivation of perfect Charity, by causing us to give to GOD, to ourselves, and to our neighbour, respectively, that which is each one's due.

FORTITUDE.

I. *The Virtue of Fortitude.*

Fortitude is the first stage in the upward course of an action, whereby it rises from a natural to a supernatural state of existence.

II. *Definition of Fortitude.*

Fortitude is the Cardinal Virtue which regulates the irascible appetite of man. It enables us to surmount all obstacles, and to overcome all difficulties which require courage to choose a lesser harm in order to avoid a greater.

III. *The Aspects of Fortitude.*

The Virtue of Fortitude assumes different aspects, according to the objects of its exercise. For instance :

1. Towards our neighbour, in the performance of our duty.
2. Towards ourselves, in cultivating self-command.
3. Towards GOD, in obedience to the Divine law.

IV. *Manner of the Exercise of Fortitude.*

The Virtue of Fortitude may be exercised

1. Actively—by *a.* Courage ; *b.* Boldness or Presence of mind ; *c.* Valour ; *d.* Manliness.
2. Passively—by *a.* Patience ; *b.* Endurance ; *c.* Contentedness.
3. In a manner which combines both—by *a.* Perseverance ; *b.* Constancy ; *c.* Resolution.

V. *The Law of Human Action which is influenced by the Virtue of Fortitude.*

The mean, or middle term, which avoids both

excess and defect in action influenced by Fortitude,

1. In active Fortitude, is called Courage ;
2. In passive Fortitude, is called Patience ;
3. In Fortitude both active and passive, is called Perseverance.

VI. *Extreme Terms in Action which is influenced by Fortitude exercised in Excess.*

The forms assumed by excessive Fortitude are threefold. They are termed, when exercised

1. Actively, Carelessness ;
2. Passively, Insensibility ;
3. Both actively and passively, Obstinacy.

VII. *Extreme Terms in Action which is influenced by Fortitude exercised in Defect.*

The forms assumed by defective Fortitude are threefold. They are termed, when exercised

1. Actively, Cowardice ;
2. Passively, Excitability ;
3. Both actively and passively, Fickleness.

VIII. *Terms in Human Action, in which the Virtue of Fortitude holds the Mean Position.*

The three terms in the moral problem, of which Fortitude, as the middle term, is exercised, in its several forms, 1. actively, 2. passively, 3. or in a manner which combines both, respectively, are,

1. *a.* Carelessness, *b.* Courage, *c.* Cowardice ;
2. *a.* Insensibility, *b.* Patience, *c.* Excitability ;
3. *a.* Obstinacy, *b.* Perseverance, *c.* Fickleness.

*PRUDENCE.**I. The Virtue of Prudence.*

Prudence is the second stage in the upward course of an action, whereby it rises from a natural to a supernatural state of existence.

II. Definition of Prudence.

Prudence is the Cardinal Virtue which regulates man's understanding. It becomes the guide of our actions, teaching us what is good and what is evil, what is right and what is wrong, what ought to be done and what ought not to be done in all actions of life.

III. The Elements of Prudence.

The elements of Prudence are fourfold :—

1. Wisdom ; which generally influences all the other elements :
2. Judiciousness ; which is aided by the Memory :
3. Vigilance ; which is aided by the Understanding :
4. Perseverance ; which is aided by the Will.

IV. Manner of the Exercise of Prudence.

The Virtue of Prudence may be exercised

1. Actively, by Judiciousness, under the forms of
a. Sagacity ; *b.* Intelligence ; *c.* Caution :
2. Passively, by Vigilance :
3. In a manner which combines both, by Perseverance, under the forms of *a.* Promptness ;
b. Diligence ; *c.* Firmness.

V. *The Law of Human Action, which is influenced by the Virtue of Prudence.*

The mean or middle term, which avoids both excess and defect in action influenced by Prudence

1. In active Prudence, is called Judiciousness ;
2. In passive Prudence, is called Vigilance ;
3. In Prudence both active and passive, is called Perseverance

VI. *Extreme Terms in Action which is influenced by Prudence exercised in Excess.*

The forms assumed by excessive Prudence are threefold. They are termed, when exercised

1. Actively, Timidity ;
2. Passively, Scrupulosity ;
3. In combination, Pertinaciousness.

VII. *Extreme Terms in Action which is influenced by Prudence exercised in Defect.*

The forms assumed by defective Prudence are threefold. They are termed, when exercised

1. Actively, Thoughtlessness ;
2. Passively, Negligence ;
3. In combination, Vacillation.

VIII. *Terms in Human Action, in which the Virtue of Prudence holds the Mean Position.*

The three terms in the moral problem, of which Prudence, as the middle term, is exercised, in its several forms, 1. actively, 2. passively, or 3. in a manner which combines both, respectively, are

1. *a.* Timidity, *b.* Judiciousness, *c.* Thoughtlessness ;
2. *a.* Scrupulosity, *b.* Vigilance, *c.* Negligence ;
3. *a.* Pertinaciousness, *b.* Perseverance, *c.* Vacillation.

JUSTICE.

I. *The Virtue of Justice.*

Justice is the third stage in the upward course of an action, whereby it rises from a natural to a supernatural state of existence.

II. *Definition of Justice.*

Justice is the Cardinal Virtue which governs man's will. It makes us give to everyone his due, teaching us to restrain every thought, word and deed which may tend to do harm to others, injury to ourselves, or dishonour to GOD.

III. *The Functions of Justice.*

The functions of Justice are threefold. They are named according to the objects of its exercise. Thus, it is exercised

1. Towards our neighbour, under the name of Equity ;
2. Towards ourselves, under the name of Consistency ;
3. Towards GOD, under the name of Devotion.

IV. *Forms of Justice towards our Neighbour.*

The three forms of Equity or Justice towards our neighbour, are, when exercised

1. Towards our subordinates, Affability ;
2. Towards our equals, Courtesy ;
3. Towards our superiors, Obedience.

V. *Manner of the Exercise of Justice.*

The Virtue of Justice may be exercised

1. Positively, to acquit ourselves of what we owe ;

2. Negatively, to abstain from doing what we must omit ;
3. Mentally or Intellectually, to hold our judgment in suspense, unbiassed,
In matters concerning GOD, ourselves, and our neighbour.

VI. *The Law of an Act of Justice towards God.*

A belief and practice founded on GOD'S absolute and infinite Justice is the mean or middle term between a belief and practice based

1. On GOD'S Wrath, apart from man's free-will :
i.e. the exaggeration of GOD'S Justice ;
2. On GOD'S Love, apart from His Divine Justice :
i.e. the deficiency of GOD'S Justice.

VII. *The Law of an Act of Justice towards Ourselves.*

Justice towards ourselves is the mean or middle term between,

1. Religious selfishness : *i.e.* the exaggeration of Justice due to ourselves ; and
2. Religious dissipation : *i.e.* the deficiency of Justice due to ourselves.

VIII. *The Law of an Act of Justice towards our Neighbour.*

Justice towards our neighbour is the mean or middle term between,

1. Prejudice : *i.e.* the exaggeration of Justice due to our neighbour ; and
2. Indifference : *i.e.* the deficiency of Justice due to our neighbour.

IX. *Terms in Human Action, in which the Virtue of Justice holds the Mean Position.*

The three terms in the moral problem, of which

Justice, as the middle term, is exercised in its several forms, 1. towards GOD, 2. ourselves, and 3. our neighbour, are,

1. Belief and practice based *a.* on GOD'S Wrath, *b.* on GOD'S Justice, *c.* on GOD'S Love ;
2. *a.* Religious selfishness, *b.* Justice to ourselves, *c.* Religious Dissipation ;
3. *a.* Prejudice, *b.* Justice to our neighbour, *c.* Indifference.

TEMPERANCE.

I. *The Virtue of Temperance.*

Temperance is the last stage in the upward course of an action, whereby it rises from a natural to a supernatural state of existence.

II. *Definition of Temperance.*

Temperance is the Cardinal Virtue which governs the fleshly appetite of man. It renders us indifferent to sensual pleasures, inducing moderation in the lawful use of all GOD'S gifts and creatures, and causing detachment from all things temporal.

III. *Forms of Temperance.*

The forms of the Virtue of Temperance are manifold. It is termed

1. Under any circumstances, Self-mastery :
2. With respect to the senses, Self-control :
3. In relation to food, Temperance ; to drink, Soberness ; to both, Abstemiousness :
4. In relation to the sexes, Continence :
5. In anger, Forbearance ; in temper, Self-command :
6. In action, Modesty ; in success, Humility ; in defeat, Hopefulness :

7. In desire, Self-conquest ; in pleasure, Self-denial :
8. In all things, Moderation.

IV. *Manner of the Exercise of Temperance.*

The Virtue of Temperance may be exercised

1. Physically ; through the medium of the five senses, Sight, Hearing, Touch, Taste, and Smelling ;
2. Intellectually ; by Speaking and Reading ;
3. In a manner which combines both ; in the use of our Money, the employment of our Time, and the choice of our Occupation and Amusements.

V. *The Law of Human Action which is influenced by the Virtue of Temperance.*

The mean or middle term, which avoids both defect and excess in action influenced by Temperance is termed

Self-mastery or Moderation.

VI. *Extreme Terms in Action which is influenced by Temperance exercised in Excess or Defect.*

The extreme terms in human affairs which exceed or fall short of the just medium of right action are respectively caused by

1. The presence of Insensibility ; or
2. The absence of Self-control.

VII. *Terms in Human Action in which the Virtue of Temperance holds the Mean Position.*

The three terms in the moral problem of which Temperance, as the middle term, is exercised, in its several forms, 1. physically, 2. intellectually, or 3. in a manner which combines both, respectively, are

- a. The presence of Insensibility, b. Perfected Self-mastery, c. The absence of Self-control.

THE FOUR CARDINAL VIRTUES.

THE CARDINAL VIRTUES.

Sermon II.

INTRODUCTION.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues: for she teacheth Temperance and Prudence, Justice and Fortitude; which are such things as men can have nothing more profitable in their life.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

IT has ever been held as a Tradition of the Church, that, amongst other things revealed during the Great Forty Days, the worldly connection between the Ecclesiastical and the Secular Power was foreshadowed by our Blessed LORD to His Apostles. Since those days, the mutual relations between the kingdoms of the world, and that Kingdom which is not of this world, have been continually changed. The points of coincidence which join, and the lines of demarcation which divide, the temporal side of the Spirituality

SERMON I.

*Tradition
on the
relation
between
Church
and State.*

SERMON

I.

and the spiritual side of the Temporality, have never been the same. No permanent, no invariable, no authoritative settlement of these vexed questions has ever been made. Almost each country has adopted its own terms and conditions of intercommunion with the Church of God. And well-nigh each century has witnessed these terms relaxed or made more binding, these conditions modified or organised anew. After eighteen hundred years of constant, even if desultory, ebb and flow, and since no changeless connection between Church and State has yet been established, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, that no changeless connection between Church and State was intended by the HOLY SPIRIT to exist. But, whatever have been the vicissitudes of this mutual dependence, it may be asserted, without danger of denial, that the Church of this age fills a position which she has never before occupied in the history of the world.

*Three
phases
of the
Church's
relation
to the
State:*

The relation which the Church has assumed, and the place which she has been either forced or suffered to occupy with respect to the State, in these latter times, may be stated in a threefold division—

in an-

I. There have been ages, when the Church

claimed obedience from the temporal power, and exercised an influence over things secular. In such times kings have been nursing fathers to the Church of CHRIST.

SERMON
I.

*thority
above the
State;*

II. There have been nations, in which Holy Church became not only the servant but the slave of the State. And kingdoms may be mentioned which have abjured their allegiance to the Church's Divine Head.

*under au-
thority to
the State;*

III. There have been both nations and times, of which these extremes cannot be affirmed. The Church was neither mistress nor servant. The State was neither tyrant nor slave. The Ecclesiastical power was not sufficiently zealous to exercise influence. The Secular power was not sufficiently in earnest to claim obedience.

*in neither
position
towards
the State.*

Three words may aptly describe the condition of the Church in these several phases—Dominance, Subjection, Lethargy. And these three aspects—dominance, subjection, and lethargy—in the mutual connection between the religious and the worldly may be termed the Ages of faith, the Days of persecution, and the Times of indifference.

*Domi-
nance,
Subjection,
Lethargy.*

The Church of the present day finds herself placed in none of these three classes. Her enemies can hardly, with justice, call

*Present po-
sition of the
Church of
Christ in*

SERMON
I.

England.

her indifferent. Her friends cannot, with truth, affirm that her influence is in the ascendant. And, though she has much of which to complain, the Church is certainly not subjected to persecution, in any way comparable to what she formerly endured. She is now taking up a new position, and one we may venture to think unassailable—a position which she has never before sought for herself, and one which, since primitive times, she has never occupied. The Church of our day neither seeks power; nor seeks to abdicate power. She no longer courts popularity with the World; neither is she enslaved to it. She is far from being lukewarm; and suffers, perhaps, more from revival after suspended animation, than from long-continued lethargy. In a word, the condition upon which the Church is now entering, and to which she now endeavours to attain, is that of *Toleration*. And a condition of *Toleration*, in all human likelihood, will be the last phase of the Church Militant before that visible and corporate Re-union of Christendom, which will eventuate in the final earthly supremacy of the Church of God.

*It simply
is desirous
of Tolera-
tion.*

*Absolute
Toleration.*

Absolute Toleration is an advantage which the Church of this country has never yet enjoyed. In her connection with the State,

SERMON
I.

she has passed through each of the stages above mentioned. She has been *in* authority ; but did not abuse her power. She has been *under* authority ; but did not lose self-respect. And, as if to show union and oneness with her LORD, she has survived the most severe of all tests of vitality—the phase of being favoured by a State too powerless to persecute, and too careless to be devout. Toleration, therefore, can be asserted neither of the domination of the Church, nor yet of her subordination. It is equally inapplicable to the lately passed days of indifference. For, the phase of lukewarmness, from which, by God's mercy, we have at length emerged, possessed the double disadvantage of actual slavery under the guise of patronage, and fictitious supremacy without its authority, its influence, or its power.

Now, wherefore may we expect the Church to enter into a state of absolute Toleration? I might answer vaguely—Because the signs of the times are suggestive of, and the events of the day tend towards, that condition. Because both the hopes of her friends and the wishes of her foes converge to that point. Because the permissive Will of God, in other nations, has sanctioned Toleration for His

*Why do we
expect
Toleration?
Answered
vaguely.*

SERMON

I.

*Answered
definitely.*

Church; and there is no good cause to suppose that we shall form an exception to the experience of other countries. Thus might I answer vaguely. But I will answer more definitely. I shall hope to show that we may expect Toleration, such as England has never before witnessed, because it is the only course to be adopted which is at once politically expedient, morally just, and religiously holy. Because the whole tide of modern thought and popular legislation sweeps that way. Because a free Church is the only anti-type to a free State. Because Toleration is the only escape from our present position, which I do not hesitate to stigmatise as utterly anomalous, scandalously unjust, and undeniably godless.

*Reasons
for holding
these
opinions.*

*The prin-
ciple of
recent
legislation
is just.*

These are hard words, my Brethren ; these are hard words. Can they be justified? Before God I think that they can. And I appeal to any who are acquainted with the history of our times to say, whether or not, of late years, the tendency of legislation has not been to lighten the bondage of, to relieve disabilities from, and to afford liberty to every form of religionism in this land except the Church of God. Observe, Brethren, abstractedly, I do not complain of the *principle*

of this legislation. In the main, it has only afforded justice, perhaps only partial justice, where much injustice had been the law for many past years. And so far the change was beneficial. But I do complain, and the Church loudly complains, of the *manner* of this legislation. If a free Church is the only antithesis to a free State, it is a violation of all consistency, that an emancipated nation should either hold in subjection, or be held in subjection to, a Church still politically enslaved. For we must not forget that each one of these political changes was adopted whilst the constitution of this country, both in theory and practice, involved the union of Church and State. There was a concordat between the two aspects of the one body corporate, sanctioned by immemorial custom and enforced by statute law. When, therefore, political privileges were accorded to those without the Church, whilst the relations between Church and State were left unaltered, the balance of the English constitution was at once and completely destroyed. Hence, that which was simply an act of justice to non-Catholics, viewed apart from the existing constitution, became in the doing, and so long as collateral measures were denied to Catholics, an act

SERMON
I.

*Its practical results
are unjust.*

SERMON
I.

*Two
courses by
which to
attain jus-
tice for the
Church
from the
State.*

*Expe-
diency
adopted
by the
Nation :*

of simple injustice towards the Church of
CHRIST.

Successive Governments, which have been called upon to deal with these complicated social questions, had the choice of two courses. Either they could dissolve the almost life-long union of Church and State in this country, and then legislate for the State without reference to the Church : or, failing this solution of many difficulties, they might have legislated for the State in conformity with such union. Alas ! The Church had neither wish nor power to insist on either of these lines of action, both of which, indeed, would have been complicated. Parliament therefore adopted a third course, which by temporary expediency has ended in permanent disorder. Statesmen did not see that they began to legislate at the wrong end of the political problem ; and would not allow that it is no true statesmanship to mitigate one evil by inflicting another. Nevertheless, whilst the Church was still left in bondage, dissenters were dispensed from disabilities which should only have been permitted, when the Church had first obtained her freedom. It matters not whether such bondage be the vassalage of fictitious supremacy, or the slavery of actual subordination. In a free country, a Church

which is not free must accept the alternative. But the nation declined to be bound by the dilemma. It ventured on a political paradox. It willed to honour a dignified Church in the midst of an emancipated people. It willed to support an enslaved Church as the teacher of a self-governed people. The result of this unnatural connection is before us. By a series of independent, haphazard reforms, reforms beginning in expediency and ending in confusion, reforms possessing but one idea—the political enfranchisement of a single class—the corporate union of Church and State has been so shattered, that the only hope for vitality lies in the absolute dissolution of the union.

SERMON
I.

and its calamitous results on the Church.

I do not purpose to enter into details to show how utterly careless the national will has been of Church principles in dealing with the State. Such details are familiar to us all. I need only glance at some results—either actual or impending—of modern legislation, from a Church point of view. And the fount and source of all injustice to the Church lies in this one fact, that, so far as by law established and on the earthly side of her spiritual existence, she is in absolute subjection to the will and pleasure of a temporary majority in

Some results to the Church of modern legislation.

The Establishment being in subjection to the House of Commons, the Church suffers,

SERMON

I.

*amongst
other ways,*

1. *in her
representa-
tive Assem-
bly;*

2. *in her
Bishops;*

3. *in her
Courts;*

4. *in her
morals;*

5. *in her
Sacra-
ments;*

6. *in her
heritage;*

the House of Commons. Nor does this statement convey the whole truth, until we consider that this majority both guides and acts for a popular assembly, of which, after little more than a single generation of a reformed existence, one-sixth part are not only not conventional members of the Church, but are numbered amongst her most bitter enemies. Mark, my Brethren, what flows from this source. Hence, the Church is debarred from self-legislation and self-government; for her Houses of Convocation are only not silenced, and her Bishops are mere nominees of the leader of the leading party in the country. Hence, the discipline of the Church is in abeyance, for she possesses no courts, in any sense Catholic; and she is at once powerless to condemn heresy, to punish immorality, or to vindicate her claims to her ancient worship. Hence, divorce is facilitated, if not encouraged; polygamy is permitted, if only one wife be retained at a time; adultery is actually legalised; and incest is only not yet sanctioned. Hence, again, registration of birth has long since taken the place of Baptism, in popular estimation; and the Sacrament of Marriage has been secularised in the Registrar's office. Hence, the property of the Church has been transferred to a Com-

mission—ironically misnamed Ecclesiastical—practically irresponsible; and consequently it has been diverted, misapplied, and squandered. Hence, again, the education of the nation—both the right to educate and the power of educating—is to be denied to the Church, in part at the Universities, in part at our public Schools, wholly, so far as GOD’S Truth is concerned, in our parish Schools. Hence, too, though I fear you may be wearied, GOD’S Own Acre, the ground consecrated for the Church’s holy dead, at this moment is the battle-field of contending parties; and hence, an agitation is now gathering force, to enable her Priests, so far as it is possible, to abjure their Holy Orders.

SERMON
I.

7. *in her
Schools;*

8. *in her
burial-
grounds;*

9. *in her
Orders.*

I have thus placed in one ghastly catalogue of sin, amongst other cases that might be mentioned, many notable instances in which the State has departed, or is about to depart, from the principle of corporate union with the Church of Christ, whilst still holding the Church to the form, and enforcing on her the disabilities, of such union. You will observe, that these instances cover almost the whole ground which can be made common to both the Temporalty and the Spirituality. They include questions of Church government, legislative and execu-

*Summary
of some
of the
wrongs of
the Church
at the
hands of
the Nation.*

SERMON

1.

tive. They include questions of doctrine, of discipline, of ceremonial. They include questions of morals, of education, and of property. Each age, each state, and each condition of a Christian man, is either under State bondage, or is subject to secular license—birth, and life, and death ; education in youth, marriage as an adult, divorce at any time, burial when life is closed. Each point in which the outward and inward life of the Church meet is liable to, and suffers from, State interference, whether it be Ecclesiastical property, the election of Bishops, Convocational legislation, the services of the Church, or the system of Appeals.

*Power of
the State
apart
from the
Church.*

Now, upon this condition of affairs, so far as the State alone is concerned, I offer no opinion. The State, as the State and independent of the Church, wills what it wishes and enacts what it wills. The State may—*i.e.* has the power to—relieve men who have lost their vocation, as public ministers, from the consequences of too hasty self-dedication. The State may—*i.e.* has the power to—sanction the burial of the dead in any given locality. The State may—*i.e.* has the power to—offer the benefits of secular and godless education, to high and low, on terms

most for the good of both. The State may —*i.e.* has the power to—divide the national property in a manner most advantageous for the nation. The State may insist on birth registration; and may allow civil contracts between man and wife, apart from all religious ceremonial. The State may legalise adultery consequent on divorce, polygamy in cases of adultery, and incest as a consolation for death, to such as are willing to avail themselves of its sanctions. The State may impose what stipulations, and enforce what terms its courts are pleased to decide for those that seek them, in faith, worship, or morals. The State, lastly, may shut the doors of one constitutional assembly at its good pleasure, and open the doors of another to those esteemed worthy by the leader of a majority in a third. And it may enslave and tyrannise over, at its own fickle will, the tool and victim—if such may be found—the tool and victim, I say, of its own creation.

The State, as the State, may do—*i.e.* has the power, and in some cases has the right to do—these and many other such like things, without interference on the part of His disciples Whose Kingdom is not of this world. But it may not join with its political pantomime, the sacred name of

SERMON
I.

*Rights of
the State
in union
with the
Church.*

SERMON
I.

CHRIST'S Church, and, call this burlesque upon Christian statesmanship, this parody of anti-Christian mis-government by the time-honoured title, in a Catholic sense, of Union of Church and State. It may not set the Church of GOD at open defiance. It may not stamp out her liberties. It may not disallow her ceremonial. It may not emasculate her education, undermine her morals, tamper with her courts, silence her assemblies, squander her heritage, and—as the last injury the State can inflict—set over the Church those that are held in the least estimation by her members, without hearty, unanimous, ceaseless efforts being made by her devoted children to obtain justice for their Spiritual Mother.

*National
politics
may some-
times be
discussed;*

My Brethren, there are times when politics not only may, but ought to be spoken of from this place. I mean not, GOD forbid that I should mean, *party* politics, the end of which is less principle than power for either side of the House of Commons. I allude to *national* politics. And the policy which the nation either has adopted, or is on the point of adopting, towards the Church of GOD, may, I think, be discussed from the platform of truth, since facts and their issues alone need

be named, actors and their motives need not be mentioned. At the present juncture, this license becomes almost a matter of obligation. For, apart from exaggeration consequent on anxiety as to the result, it may be affirmed that we are living in the course of events and on the eve of a crisis, simply unparalleled in the history of either the English Church or Nation. I have, therefore, ventured to place before you, in outline, some incidents in the course of events in which we play a part : and I have done so, in order that we may see clearly that we live on the verge of a crisis which is not only impending, but towards which we are positively hastening.

With these incidents fresh in our mind, I think we shall admit, that the Toleration of which I spoke is the only escape from our present unhappy and anomalous position. We have tested the working of a privileged Church in the midst of a people amongst whom all privileges are being gradually abolished. It has been found wanting. We have attempted to combine a dominant Religion with freedom of thought, freedom of opinion, freedom of speech, freedom of action. The attempt has utterly failed. We have sought to adapt Christian principles to the popular will. And the popular will has turned ; and, so far as it

SERMON
I.

*sometimes
ought to be.*

*Toleration
is the only
remedy
for these
anomalies,*

SERMON

I.

*and is
earnestly to
be desired.*

was bound by them, has ignored Christian principles. As I have said, a free Church is the only legitimate and inevitable out-come of a free State ; and the whole tide of modern legislation has strongly set that way. There is no doubt, as it has been shown, that the foundation of all the popular legislation we have considered, ought in mere consistency—not to speak of common justice—to have been based upon the Church's freedom. And the absence of this element has caused much that was otherwise just and good, to be bad and unjust. But there is also no doubt, that the freedom of the Church underlies the principle of all modern independence, though it be held in solution ; and that it only needs this complement of popular enfranchisement to equalise all actual inequalities, and to make consistent all apparent anomalies. Such, my Brethren, such is the persuasion which gives rise to the hope we so earnestly indulge, that the Church is at last on the point of attaining that Toleration which is the fulfilment of all recent legislation, and which is the only course to be adopted at once politically expedient, morally just, and religiously holy.

*Four
aspects of*

Upon the *form* which Toleration is about to assume amongst us, I shall venture no

opinion. Neither is it needful to discuss the point. It is not to be expected that Toleration may be purchased without some sacrifice. Perhaps it would not be desirable. Yet the temporal accidents of the Church possess so many more firm friends than her spiritual essentials, that it is far from unlikely that the earthly position of the liberated Establishment may be less untoward than her enemies permit themselves to anticipate. Privileges, however, in former years, have been largely connected with the condition of dignified domination. These have been enjoyed by the Church to the full. How they may have been employed, I do not pause to enquire. There are also many privileges inseparably connected with acquired Toleration. These, also, may be enjoyed in no less abundance. How they will be taken advantage of, by the Church, remains to be seen. Meanwhile, we must be prepared for the change, in what form soever it may come, which is impending. For it can hardly be doubted that the change is fast coming upon us. A few years ago, and it was held to be visionary to anticipate, within our lifetime, the state of Toleration to which the Church of Ireland has attained. The idea, however, was hardly offered for public consideration before it was

SERMON

I.

*future
Toleration:
1. its
form:*

2. its time:

SERMON

I.

3. *its manner ;*

4. *our position towards Toleration.*

acted upon. There was little need of educating the mind of the nation to the point. And the speed, facility, and suddenness with which she gained her independence, is at once an encouragement and a warning to ourselves. But on this point, also, the *time*, no less than the *manner* in which Toleration may be in store for us, I offer no opinion. Putting aside then the manner in which Toleration may be offered to us, the time at which it may be enforced upon us, and the form it will eventually assume amongst us, there is still one other aspect in which Toleration may be viewed, which it is one object of these Sermons to discuss. And that aspect is—not the position which Toleration will take towards us, but—the position which we, as in GOD's sight, must assume towards Toleration.

The Cardinal Virtues in a two-fold relation :

1. *to the*

It is not without a purpose, my Brethren, that I have asked you to consider with me some points in the present phase of the connection between Church and State, with a view to coming Toleration. The Four Cardinal Virtues play their part in a double capacity. They are concerned not only with the ordinary details of the every-day life of private Christians ; but also with the position

we are called upon to occupy in the world, as English Catholics. As we discuss the Virtues one by one, we shall find many matters in our private life to speak of, individually, which could not be estimated in general terms. But it is otherwise with the place we fill in society at large as Churchmen. Our position as citizens can only be fully realised by estimating the treatment which both the Church—and we in the Church—have received at the hands of the State. And this treatment can best be understood by making a general survey of certain questions upon which the two sides of the national existence are at issue; and which, to a larger or less degree, the one side attempts to enforce, and the other side is forced to accept. This I have endeavoured to make as shortly as an epitome of a wide subject would permit. We shall now be at liberty to consider, on these Sunday mornings after Easter, the Virtues of Fortitude, of Prudence, of Justice, and of Temperance. But, before I conclude, I desire to place before you two thoughts, to which I beg your attention now, and on which bye-and-bye I invite discussion between yourselves.

SERMON
I.

*private
life of
Christians;
2. to
Catholics
in public
life.*

*Two
thoughts in
conclusion.*

I. The first thought is the more private of 1. *The pro-*

SERMON

I.

*spects of
the Church
are depen-
dant upon
the charac-
ter of her
children.*

the two. The prospects of the Church of to-day depend to a large extent, speaking humanly, upon the characters of the actors in passing events, and how they avail themselves of the opportunities which God places in their way. The prospects of the Church of the future depend upon the same to a much larger extent. Individual characters, the characters of individual units of society, the characters of each one of you, my Brothers and Sisters in CHRIST, how little so-ever it may appear on the surface, do exercise a real and actual influence on events through which we all, in common, pass. The characters of many exert the like influence in a larger proportion. It is far from unlikely that we, of this generation, will be called upon to work for the Church in her transition from a state of dominance, to a condition of toleration. The welfare, then, of the present Church, the interests of the Church of the future, depend in a measure and to a certain extent upon ourselves. The more we discipline ourselves, exercise self-command, and cultivate holiness of life, the more widely, deeply, and beneficially shall we influence others. Great movements effected by men of undisciplined wills and lives, or of lives and wills out of harmony with their

SERMON
I.

actions, are seldom satisfactory, are never lasting. But a body of self-disciplined men, living self-devoted lives, animated by one will and bent on one end, acting on right principles and working together in unity, cannot fail to leave upon their age a permanent mark for good. It is one object of these Sermons to help on this result—the good of the Church and the greater glory of GOD—in helping you to attain self-command by the cultivation of the Four Cardinal Virtues.

II. The second thought is of a more public nature. I have spoken at length on the Toleration to which we, both as Catholics and as citizens, hope to attain. This Toleration is of two kinds. It includes toleration of the State by the Church, and toleration of the Church by the State, both of which are involved in that division of the union of Church and State which we call Disestablishment. But there is a third kind of Toleration which is simply intolerable—the toleration on both sides of the present condition, which is, in truth, no toleration; a condition which tolerates the existence of a dominant Church in a free State, which tolerates the junction of an infidel State with a Catholic Church. I am not now concerned to show the in-

2. *Toleration of the present state of affairs is intolerable.*

SERMON

I.

consistencies which are involved on the part of the Nation, by supporting a Religion at once supreme and in subjection. But I am very nearly concerned to show to Catholics the inconsistencies which are inseparable from union with a Secular body which has ceased, corporately, to be Christian. Let us consider, then, that the Church, as the Church, so far as she silently assents to and does not earnestly protest against the continuance of the present godless alliance, so far is she responsible before God and man for the sacrilege. Let us remember that we, as members of the Church, each one of us, have a voice that can be heard, a will that may be felt, means to apply, neighbours to influence, and an unoccupied field in which to labour ; and, to the like extent, that we are accountable for the same. And let us not forget, that so far and to the like extent as, either the Church or the members of it, fail to do their utmost to secure relaxation, immunity and freedom from this unholy alliance, to the like extent and so far are they responsible for evils which cry aloud to God for justice ; so far and to the same extent are we, my Brethren—for I wish to make the charge individual and personal—are you and I accountable before God for the sins which have been enumerated.

I will only add that on the following Sunday mornings I shall hope to consider the influence of the Cardinal Virtues, one by one, on our lives, as private Christians. In the concluding Sermon I may be enabled to point out how the Virtues of Fortitude, Prudence, Justice, and Temperance, cultivated in our every-day life, will exercise their influence upon our thoughts, words, and actions in the public events which are impending in the dissolution of the union of Church and State.

On Sunday next, God willing, I shall speak to you of the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude.

A. M. D. G.

SERMON
I.

Conclusion.

Sermon II.

FORTITUDE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues : for she teacheth . . . Fortitude.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

SERMON
II.

Fortitude.

*Definition
of the
Virtue,*

*under three
conditions ;*

- THE first of the Four Cardinal Virtues which we have to consider is the Virtue of Fortitude.
- The Virtue of Fortitude is capable of receiving many various definitions according to the aspect which it bears, to the events which call it forth, and to the manner in which it is employed. In general terms, it may be defined to be that moral Virtue which conforms whom it influences to the permissive Will of GOD exercised towards themselves. This conformity may be evidenced in at least three ways. For, under certain contingencies, Fortitude gives us power, *first*, to do all that we ought to perform ; *secondly*, to bear all that we ought to endure ; *thirdly*, to act as we are
- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.

bound to act, for the glory of GOD, for our own salvation, and for the good of the souls of others.

The manner in which we are enabled to conform ourselves to the permissive Will of GOD, by Fortitude, is manifold. The Virtue may be exercised either actively, or passively, or in a condition which includes both. In each of these cases Fortitude discharges a different office; and hence, acquires a different name, which varies with its functions and their performance. For instance — to take each of the three phases in order :

*Three
phases of
Fortitude.*

First. Consider the aspect of Fortitude when viewed actively. In cases of personal danger, or in affairs of difficulty, the Virtue when exercised is called *courage*. In a life of adventure, in times of excitement, or in moments of surprise, it is called *boldness*, or *presence of mind*. In war, revolution, or contest, it is called *valour*. In social qualities, or in physical relations, it is called *manliness*.

*Active
Fortitude.*

Secondly. Consider the Virtue when exerted passively. In cases of sickness, disease, or malady, Fortitude, in accepting the permissive Will of GOD, is termed *patience*. In suffering, bodily, spiritual, or mental, it is termed *endurance*. In bearing with that position and

*Passive
Fortitude.*

SERMON
II.

*The phase
which com-
bines both.*

state of life to which GOD has called us, it is termed *contentedness*.

Thirdly. Consider the phase which combines features both of the active and passive functions of Fortitude. Long continued exertion in any given work is named *perseverance*. Tenacity of purpose, in the face of opposition, is named *firmness*, or *constancy*. Adherence to principles in spite of persecution, annoyance, or vexation, is named *resolution*.

*The aspects
and func-
tions of
Fortitude
towards*

1. *our
neighbour;*

2. *our
selves;*

3. *our
God.*

From these various standpoints, the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude assumes a different aspect, and performs different functions towards others, ourselves, and GOD. First, Fortitude enables us to surmount all outward difficulties and dangers, to overcome every obstacle, and to suffer every trial, rather than to fail in our duty *towards our neighbour*. This is its first function. Next, Fortitude supplies us with moral principle to abstain from choosing the greater harm before a lesser, when one of the two is needful to be chosen: and it gives us moral power and energy to undergo the lesser evil in order to avoid a greater, when a freedom of choice is allowed. This is its second function *towards ourselves*. Fortitude, lastly, arms the soul with supernatural strength in her warfare against her spiritual enemies, giving her confidence

to subdue fear, and constancy to suffer loss and pain, rather than to sin *against her God*. And this is the third function of the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude.

SERMON
II.

The consideration of the Four Cardinal Virtues, in their entirety, involves the consideration of certain abstract propositions, which, in theory, are more or less connected with them all; or, by which, in practice, they are more or less influenced. We have to discuss, one by one, these Four Virtues. The relation between the Virtues and the propositions respectively, may be considered in two ways. Either all the abstract questions may be spoken of in connection with each of the Virtues—which would necessitate superficial treatment, repetition, and consumption of time. Or, one or more of the points may be considered in relation to the several Virtues in succession—a plan which will allow of a fuller discussion of each question, avoid repetition, and economise time. Let us adopt the latter alternative; and, without further preface, suffer me to place before you the first of these abstract propositions to which I desire to draw your attention.

*Abstract
proposi-
tions con-
nected with
the practice
of the
Virtues.*

I. To begin at the beginning of most ques- I. *Human*

SERMON
II.

*nature is
capable to
exercise
Fortitude.*

tions connected with Virtue in the concrete, I will assume for human nature the abstract quality of possessing a capacity for the exercise of the Virtue of Fortitude. However wicked man may be, or is, he undoubtedly has a capacity for exercising this Virtue. He has that within him which only needs to be vivified by a certain influence, to produce a certain result. Of course, this vivifying power is the gift of Sacramental Grace. The mystery of the Incarnation, extended to each one of us through the channels of the Sacraments, influences our actions to such an extent, that, by oneness with our Divine LORD, our works become absolutely good, and capable to acquire merit. Hence, amongst other Virtues, man is enabled to exercise the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude. And this is the first point which I desired to enforce upon you. For, if we are capable to exercise this Virtue, we are, unquestionably, accountable before GOD if we exercise it not. For instance: bearing in mind the definitions we have made—let us say—of the *active* side of this Virtue, we must never forget that human nature has a capacity for, and that we, personally and individually, are capable of cultivating, as the case may be, one or more

of these aspects of Fortitude, Courage, or Boldness, or Valour, or Manliness, for GOD, for our neighbour, and for ourselves.

SERMON
II.

II. If, then, it be granted that human nature is capable of exercising this Virtue, we must not forget that in practice, and so far as we are personally concerned, Fortitude must be considered as a state of action, not as a mere matter of feeling; as a custom, not only as a faculty; as a habit, and not alone as a solitary act. It is true, and may not be denied, that feelings influence actions; that the custom presupposes the faculty; that the act anticipates the habit. But it is only by a succession of single acts, that habits are formed; it is only by constant employment of the faculties, that customs are acquired; it is only by systematically energising the feelings, and calling them into play, that a state of action is produced. For example, to take an instance for illustration, from each of the three phases of Fortitude:—*Active* Fortitude may not be developed, without the feeling of Courage being animated by action. *Passive* Fortitude may not be realised, without the faculty of Patience being kindled by custom. And Fortitude which is *at once active*

2. *Fortitude is a state of action, not a matter of feeling.*

SERMON
II.

and *passive*, may not be evoked, without the persevering use of single acts until they become habitual.

3. *In what
consists
a perfect
act of
Fortitude?*

III. Such is the second of the abstract questions I desired to place before you. And the third is a legitimate outcome of the two former. For, if we admit (1) that each one of us is capable of exercising Fortitude; and if we allow (2) that the cultivation of Fortitude ensues from the habitual use of single acts; it behoves us to enquire, in the third place (3), in what consists a perfect act of this Cardinal Virtue; by what evidence does it lay claim to the title; to what extent must certain features appear in its results to constitute the perfectibility of such an act. Now, there are three elements of action by which each individual effort of natural boldness may be gauged, to decide whether or not it may be considered to be a supernatural act of the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude. These three elements include a *motive*, a *law*, and a *test*. We will shortly consider these elements in the order in which they are named.

*It consists
of three
factors.*

I. *The
motive of
an act of
Fortitude,
the glory
of God.*

I. The *motive* for an act of Fortitude to be perfect must be simply this—the greater glory of GOD. Nothing that falls short of the glory of GOD will suffice to raise a natural action

even one degree towards that standard of perfection which is implied in doing an act of Fortitude. Possessing, however, a right motive, the action, in the next place, must be subject to a certain law. And

SERMON
II.

2. This *law* is obeyed in avoiding either excess or defect in action; and this is the second element of perfectibility. The avoidance of these extremes involves a consideration of the just 'mean,' or middle term, which lies between them. And, in the exercise of Christian Fortitude, in what may this consist? It may not be easy to decide, in each instance of the three forms of the Virtue which have been mentioned, what may respectively be the defect, the 'mean,' or middle term, and the excess of Fortitude. Perhaps in all cases it is not possible. Neither is it needful to distinguish between the absolute and relative 'mean' in each case: nor to indicate the instances in which no middle course is either lawful or practicable, or both. But, it may be well to note shortly, how the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude, in each of its phases, in point of fact, is a mean between exuberance and deficiency. Thus—Take its active phase. The 'mean' state of the Virtue is Courage. But, on the one hand, men may exceed the 'mean' either in the absence of cautious fear,

2. *The law; the mean between excess and defect.*

Examples:

in the active phase of the Virtue, Courage;

SERMON
II.

*in the
passive
phase,
Patience;*

*in the
phase
which com-
bines both,
Perseve-
rance.*

*3. The
test; that
it causes
satisfac-
tion.*

or in the presence of over-much confidence—either of which we term *carelessness*. Or, on the other hand, men may fall short of the ‘mean’ and possess too much fear, or too little confidence—both of which we call *cowardice*. Hence, the middle term of Courage stands equidistant between Carelessness and Cowardice. Again—Take the passive state of Fortitude. Patience, in this instance, may be considered as the typical mean. And a man may either have an excess of patience, which we call *insensibility*; or he may have a defect of patience, which we term *excitability*. In this case, then, the just ‘mean’ between Excitability and Insensibility is the Virtue of Patience. Once more—Take the phase of Fortitude which, under different conditions, is at once active and passive. Perseverance may be quoted as an instance in point. And Perseverance here holds the balance, with equal hand, between the exaggeration of Fortitude, which has a tendency to become *doggedness* or *obstinacy*; and the incompleteness of Fortitude, which degenerates into *fickleness*, *weakness*, or *vacillation*.

3. We have thus discussed the motive which influences, and the law which guides a perfect act of Fortitude. An act, however, which both takes the middle course between

defect and excess, and also is done for the glory of God, needs yet one more feature to entitle it to the name of a Christian act of Fortitude. This forms the *test* of which I spoke. And the test of a perfect act consists in this—whether the action, in the doing, is a cause of pleasure or of pain. This last element, however, time forbids me, on the present occasion, to do more than mention.

SERMON
II.

Such, my Brethren, are the three methods of estimating an act of Fortitude, to determine on its claims to be considered an act of a Cardinal or supernaturalised Virtue—by a motive, by a law, by a test. And these three factors exhaust the constituent parts of a perfect act of Virtue. It must cause mental satisfaction in execution. It must be performed, physically, with neither exaggeration nor deficiency. It must be done, intentionally, for the greater glory of God. *Summary.*

On one point I feel that it is necessary to offer a word, at once of caution and encouragement, before we advance further. It has been said that these three elements constitute a perfect act of the Virtue of Fortitude. Such, undoubtedly, is the case in theory. In practice, however, it must not be supposed

*Caution
and en-
courage-
ment :
practical
perfection
cannot be
secured ;*

SERMON
II.
—

*God's
mercy to be
relied on.*

that each of these elements is to be found perfectly developed in each several exercise of this Virtue. In the case of those with whom we have to deal, *viz.*, others, and in the case of those with whom others have to deal, *viz.*, ourselves, both being imperfect agents, this cannot be depended on, and will seldom be realised. We may not expect to perform perfect acts of any Virtue perfectly. Even in the closest corporate union with our Divine LORD, a sufficient element of mere humanity will ever be left to hinder absolute perfectibility, either in design or in detail. We may only hope in the mercy of GOD, to be pleased to accept our effort, when, with the purest intention we may command, and the most single-minded performance we may exert, on behalf of any given act of Fortitude, it still falls short of positive perfection. We may hope, aye, we may surely hope, under such circumstances, that what is superfluous may be taken away ; what is insufficient may be supplied ; what is imperfect may be made more holy ; what is actually evil may be purified and forgiven. We may hope for acceptance, as we offer up our will and deed, even when our acts are not done without an admixture of selfishness in their intention, to the glory of GOD : even

when there is no well-adjusted balance between excess and defect, in their performance; even when, in their issue, there is no sensation of satisfaction, but rather the opposite. In full assurance of such hope, we must persistently seek after perfection, despite all short-comings, in the concerns of life by which Fortitude may be cultivated—let us say, to turn again once more to former definitions—passively, by the help of these three factors. We must learn to discipline our souls to accept the permissive Will of God, exercised upon ourselves, in the form of Patience, or in the form of Endurance, or in the form of Contentedness.

Let us now survey the position at which we have arrived in our estimate of the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude. We have seen, 1. that Fortitude may be exercised in a three-fold manner—actively, passively, and under circumstances which combine both. Then, 2. found cause to admit that a capacity for Fortitude is innate in all Christian men and women; and that the germ needs only the fertilising influence of Sacramental Grace to energise it into life. Next, 3. we allowed that the habitual repetition of single acts of Fortitude alone can ensure its healthy and

*Review of
our posi-
tion.*

SERMON
II.

The additional points to be considered bye-and-bye.

1. *Four conditions of perfection.*

2. *Two characteristics of an act.*

3. *Four phases of moral action.*

vigorous cultivation. And lastly, 4. we noted the three elements which tend to elevate a natural act of Fortitude into one that is above nature—the motive of God's glory in intention, the law of the happy medium in action, the test of gratification in after-thought. Other abstract questions may be kept for future consideration. It may not, however, be amiss simply to state certain points—three in number—which will demand attention hereafter, and having stated them to leave them unexamined. *Firstly*. Further thought and inquiry will probably show us, that, over and above the elements of perfectibility which have been mentioned, there are certain conditions to be fulfilled, before we may positively affirm of any action that it has become supernaturalised by the influence of the Cardinal Virtues. The conditions are four in number. The act must have been done, 1. with a full knowledge of the deed; 2. after free moral choice; 3. disinterestedly; 4. upon principle. In the *second* place we shall be called on to distinguish between the two characters of an act, with their subdivisions, voluntary and involuntary. And *thirdly*, we must shortly trace the course of an action, and show how moral choice reduced to practice passes through four phases

before its consummation. For instance, there is—1. an end to be aimed at ; 2. consideration as to means ; 3. a choice of means ; and 4. the will to act on. In short—we wish, we deliberate, we decide, and we will.

SERMON
II.

We will now turn at once to the practical *Practice.*
side of the question.

The subject of the Cardinal Virtues is a difficult subject at the present day to insist upon, from a Christian point of view. And it is difficult, not because the nineteenth century is not practical—which, emphatically, it is—but because our times are averse from doing anything upon principle ; whilst a principle which claims to be Catholic, becomes in its eyes positively hateful. In no sense do we live in one of the ages of faith ; and hence we are but little influenced by the Cardinal Virtues, which, in act and deed, are the offspring of those ages. We may be, possibly we are, physically and constitutionally, by custom, habit, or fashion, in the practice of the outward features of one or more of the Cardinal Virtues. We may be, possibly we are, bold, or wise, or just, or sober. But we are not, we do not profess to be, sober, just, wise, or bold, upon principle ; and

*Practical
difficulties
in discussing the
Virtues,
for society
declines to
act upon
principle.*

SERMON
II.

hence we are not, and cannot be, influenced by Christian Fortitude, by Christian Prudence, by Christian Justice, and by Christian Temperance. Our qualities are all natural qualities. They do not rise above nature. They possess no element of the supernatural ; and hence are not elevated into the position of Graces. We do good, but not right—and a wide chasm divides the two. We are moral, but not virtuous. We are devout, but not holy. We are respectable, but not godly.

*One cause
of this
want of
principle is*

That such is a true statement of the case admits of no doubt. Neither is the cause far to be sought. If we consider the points already laid down—for example—the three elements of perfectibility which anticipate, mark, or follow the first of the Cardinal Virtues, we shall easily discover the cause. Modern Society sins to a large extent against more than one of these canons. Let us take but a single one ; and it may be fearlessly asserted, that England of to-day knows nothing of, and cares little for, this touchstone of Christian holiness—Fortitude—by reason of its intense and absolute selfishness. The many-headed demon of Self, under the forms of self-seeking, self-pleasing, and selfishness, has utterly taken possession of, monopolised,

Selfishness.

 SERMON
II.

and emasculated the spirit of the times. To such an extent has this demoniacal possession ensued, that the patient is utterly unconscious of his condition. Ignorant of his real state, he flatters himself on taking thought and action for others, in matters and questions which are little else but refined and subtle efforts of cultivated and civilised selfishness. And the afflicted one self-confidently boasts of his popular legislation ; takes credit for his ceaseless reforms ; proclaims himself generous for his ostentatious and pompous subscription-lists ; prides himself on his impatient philanthropy ; and at once busies himself, and distracts all who come in contact with him, by his excitable and feverish social science.

We will not, however, further argue against an abstraction, be it never so wicked. But I will take leave to say, that, as there are none of the deadly sins which may not look for their source from gratified selfishness ; so, persons who yield themselves to this debasing and anti-Christian vice can never hope to cultivate the Virtue of Fortitude. To this absorbing idolatry—the worship of self—the present century is enslaved ; and hence the Virtue pleaded for has small chance of acceptance, as a Virtue. And yet, even at the pre- *Selfishness a note of the present age ; yet are*

SERMON
II.

*there many
bright ex-
ceptions to
this law.*

sent day, there are bright and noble exceptions to this exacting law of society. There are exceptions which would add lustre to any age, and would tend to leaven any phase of common life. These may be found by all who seek them—for society is large, and the mixture of good and evil is wide spread on either side. I will mention but a few which occur to myself at the moment.

*From the
last phase
of Forti-
tude :*

*the Sister
of Mercy ;*

*the Parish
Priest.*

For instance—The delicately nurtured, highly sensitive, accomplished woman gives up the world, and casts in her lot with an active Religious Society, whose special function it is to nurse the sick poor in their own squalid homes, be the disease never so infectious, never so loathsome. A Priest, a fellow of his College, in a good sense of the word, a cultivated ‘man of the world,’ gives up the position, comforts, and advantages of a family country-living, or an eligible town-cure, to labour almost alone in an uncongenial sphere of work, amongst the degraded population of a district mission. Here, in both these cases, so far as the elements of perfection, which I have named, are observed, and in proportion as they are observed—here, we have two cases of Christian Fortitude from every-day life. And these are but specimens of the last phase of Fortitude, which com-

bines the active and the passive forms of the Virtue.

SERMON
II.

Take other instances, from the first phase of the Virtue of Fortitude—the active. The pitman or collier, after some disastrous and heart-rending explosion, and long before the danger is past, adventures himself into the suffocating shaft, to save those who have not been buried alive or scorched to death. The annals of our naval and military services, in time of war, or in cases of shipwreck, are simply full of acts of Fortitude. But in the merchant service, a small coasting steamer, upon our own shores, was the scene but lately of many such acts, when, after collision with a larger steamer, the captain and many of the sailors sank with the vessel, because the passengers entrusted to their care were the first to be saved.

*From the
first phase:
the Collier;*

*the Mer-
chant Sea-
man.*

Nor shall we fail to find cases of passive Fortitude in passing events, if we only take the pains to seek for them. Witness the conduct of the Statesman, who withdraws from place and power, from office, dignity, and position, rather than compromise his principles and vote in opposition to his convictions. Witness the friend, who bears, as he holds, with undeserved calumny, and years of suspicion unjustly earned—mistaken though the feeling

*From the
second
phase:
the States-
man ;*

the Friend

SERMON
II.

may be, and I think was—rather than forsake his coadjutors at the voice of popular and prejudiced clamour. Here, again, so far as these actions are performed in accordance with the canons of supernatural Virtue, and to the extent to which they conform to such canons, are they to be considered as acts of Christian Fortitude.

*These cases
are real
but excep-
tional.*

The cases I have mentioned are no fancy pictures. They are drawn from life : and I doubt not that your own memory will easily call to mind further examples. These are, however, either more exceptional in character, than guided by law such as we may follow ; or, their influence is rather life-long, than merely affecting every-day existence. Let us then pass on from these comparatively anomalous cases, which influence the few, to more common-place examples of daily life, in its manifold circumstances, which concern the many.

*Consider
cases which
concern the
many.*

Let us consider in what way, in the ordinary affairs of life, ordinary persons may hope to be able to act up to the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude, actively, passively, or under both conditions, to the glory of GOD, their own salvation, and the good of souls.

Though

At first sight, there do not appear to be

many ways, in this matter of fact age, in which we have a chance of exercising Christian Fortitude. Every-day life, with its endless circle of infinite littlenesses, hardly affords scope for the use of so lofty a Virtue. So think superficial observers; and so argue those who are not anxious to cultivate its duties. And yet, in the way in which it is possible to act up to its teaching, there are many forms of action. Each one of the littlenesses of which life is composed affords scope, or may be made to afford scope, for its exercise. It is true, that all the forms in which the cultivation of Fortitude is possible, are not equally imposing or equally attractive. But, they are not, on such account, the less to be commended. It is true, that the age in which we live cannot do much to place our Fortitude on its mettle. But, yet, a considerable amount of Fortitude may be expended on comparatively insignificant circumstances. Out of many which might be quoted, I propose to take one instance which comes very near indeed to a large class of persons at the present day. I allude, in cases in which we differ from those with whom we live in matters of faith, to the home-life of a Catholic, as a Catholic. And I wish to point out shortly, yet with sufficient clearness for practical pur-

SERMON
II.

not apparent, there are many ways in which to exercise Fortitude.

One instance may be taken; the home-life of a Catholic.

SERMON
II.

poses, how such a life may best be arranged, under certain contingencies, and in certain phases, with a view to the exercise of Fortitude.

*An adult
subjected to
conscientious
opposition.*

We will contemplate the case of an adult, living in a family circle in which he may be exposed to conscientious and deliberate opposition. *Conscientious*, I say—for I will not suppose the opposition he may meet with to be caused by any but the highest of motives. *Adult*—because I will not now consider the case of one under definite authority. In such a case as this, then, how may a Catholic hope to act up to the spirit of the Virtue of Fortitude?

*Wherefore
he meets
with oppo-
sition.*

Before I attempt to answer this question, let us enquire, to what such an one's people object which causes their opposition, and wherefore they object? They object to many things for many reasons. For instance—to take only common-place objections: They object to Confession—because they say that it is soul-destroying; which it is not. They object to the sign of the holy Cross—because they hold that it is superstitious; which it is not. They object to fasting—because they affirm that it injures the health; which, sometimes, it may. They object to early Mass—

*Objections
are made
to*

1. *Confession,*
2. *sign of the Cross,*
3. *fasting,*
4. *Mass,*

because they think it is such an exertion to rise betimes; which it certainly is, specially at the first. They object to late Even-song on week-days—because they find that it interferes with family arrangements; which is fairly possible. They object to many other things, for equally good, or equally bad reasons, which you can as easily imagine as I can mention. They object—for example—to visiting the sick; to teaching in schools; to self-dedication in convents; to retreats; to intercourse with the clergy; to systematic alms-giving; to fasting communion, which is a Catholic's duty; to keeping Advent or Lent; to reading 'red-edged' books, as they have been called; to the use of a Crucifix; to the practice of mid-day prayer; to bowing to the Altar; to kneeling in the Creed; to worshipping without reception, which is a Catholic's privilege, at either high or low celebrations of the Holy Eucharist.

Now, how are we to act, when we are subjected to objections such as I have named, by the help of the Virtue of Fortitude? I assume, of course, that all which is done by us, is lawful and good to be done. But I cannot avoid noting, in how indiscriminating a temper the objections are made, how unworthy are some, and how childish are others

SERMON
II.

5. *Vespers,*

6. *and many other things for good or bad reasons.*

How we may deal with such opposition.

SERMON
II.

*Two lines
may be
drawn,
dividing
three cases :*

*1. in cases
of necessity;*

*2. in cases
of edifica-
tion ;*

*3. in cases
which lie
on either*

—including, in one sweeping condemnation, things both capable and incapable of abuse.

And I answer thus :—I draw a distinct line, in these and similar instances, in two distinct places. I cut off, and absolutely, in the first place, (1) all cases of necessity. In cases of necessity, as in other matters, so in questions of morals, there is no law. Where the Sacraments are at stake, or the soul's health is directly concerned, there can be no hesitation in saying—Act up to the dictates of your conscience by the aid of Fortitude, come what hardship, what difficulty, what opposition, what unpleasantness there may.

(2.) This is the first line of demarcation, between things essential for the soul, and things for the soul's edification only. But there is a second line of division. And this, in matters edifying, but not essential, divides all that may be done without giving cause of offence, from all that may be done while offence is given. In such a case, the law is equally plain, if not equally binding—You are at perfect liberty to act as the Church advises, in personal matters, so long as charity is not lost ; and further, you are bound so to act, if your conscience compels.

(3.) These two divisions, 1. of things essential, which must be done at all hazards, even

at the cost of scandal ; and 2. of things edifying, which only may be done if charity be not endangered—these two divisions leave a wide margin between them for things a little less than essential, and a little more than edifying. These last ought now to be considered. But, ‘Church Privileges,’ as they may be termed, in the strict sense of the words, vary so widely in the case of individual souls, and to such an extent, that it is impossible to offer any general counsel upon them, likely to meet particular cases. The only advice, therefore, which I will give is this—Take these difficulties to your director ; ask his judgment upon them ; and be guided by his decision.

SERMON
II.

side of both.

It will be observed that these specifications are not sufficiently explicit. Let me endeavour, then, to be definite. Out of many which may be chosen, take two typical examples of practices respectively edifying and essential. I. Attendance at Daily Prayer, specially at the Vesper service, is a Catholic custom, of which the value to souls can hardly be exaggerated. But it is edifying only. It may not be termed essential. Hence, I would urge—If going to Church at eight o'clock in the morning, and at eight at

*Particular
instances
dealt with :*

I. *in*
*matters
edifying ;*

SERMON

II.

night, gives continual, insurmountable offence—however' unreasonably—to those you live with, *Do not go!* Fortitude may be exercised equally, though in opposite ways, both in going and in not going. In going, you would exercise the Virtue actively. In not going, you would cultivate it passively. And since, in this case, positive duty calls you not to action, the abstaining from self-gratification, even in holy things, by the aid of passive Fortitude, is the higher, and consequently the more acceptable to GOD, of the forms of Fortitude which may be exercised.

2. *in matters essential.*

2. But, attendance at daily Mass is a Catholic custom of which the value to souls cannot be exaggerated. It is not only edifying, but for purposes of worship, of communion, and of oneness with GOD, it is essential. In this case, therefore, the terms of the dilemma being reversed, the opposite advice can alone be given by any Catholic Priest. Here, passive Fortitude plays no part, save in the endurance of consequences in action and after action. But active Fortitude is called into operation. And active Fortitude will cause us to accept the counsel which I offer. For, here I would urge you, with all the persuasion I may employ—Whatever opposition you may meet with, *Come!* Come to GOD's

own Service ! Come to worship your SAVIOUR upon His own Altar ! Come to receive your Divine LORD in His own most sacred Feast.

SERMON
II.

And the same advice I would tender, and as unhesitatingly, in regard to other essentials to the spiritual life. Take the case of Confession. If Confession be essential to your soul's health—of which, mark you, my Brethren, your own conscience be the judge and not another's—then, neither the wishes, nor the desires, nor the entreaties, no, nor even the commands of any human being should keep you from that blessed Sacrament. You must obey GOD rather than man. But, on the other hand, if it be the outward use of the sign of the Cross, for example, before or after meals—though you will not, I hope, think me indifferent to the sacred symbol—or if it be a question about any equivalent Catholic usage, which is edifying indeed, but is not essential, then, I would say, as I said before—Confer with your confessor, and be guided by his judgment.

Similar cases :

1. *on the one side, Confession;*

2. *on the other, the sign of the Cross.*

It is not without danger of being misunderstood that these general observations are made, without qualifications, before a mixed congregation. Worse than danger, however,

Conclusion.

SERMON
II.

would ensue, if such questions were never discussed in public : and from the nature of the case, if made at all, to be of any practical benefit, the suggestions must be dogmatic in form. I shall be content, however, to leave the subject, for your consideration, with this warning—that I have spoken to-day of Christian Fortitude only, and that Christian Prudence, Justice, and Temperance have yet to be discussed. Fortitude forms but a single element out of the four factors of moral perfection. Each Virtue plays its part in the complicated movement, and influences in succession the other three Virtues. How these influences are exerted, I shall hope to show hereafter. I will only now add one qualification : That which Fortitude extorts at any cost—either actively, or passively, or in combination—Prudence will modify, and make less antagonistic to the prejudices of others. And of this I purpose to speak, GOD willing, on Sunday next.

A. M. D. G.

Sermon III.

PRUDENCE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues : for she teacheth . . Prudence.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

THE Cardinal Virtue of Prudence may be defined to be a supernatural Grace which combines certain features of, and to some extent is equivalent to, the human qualities of Wisdom, Judiciousness, Vigilance, and Perseverance. It is also largely influenced by the three powers of the mind—the Memory, the Understanding, and the Will.

SERMON
III.

Prudence.

Prudence, therefore, is a composite and many-sided Virtue.

*The elements of
Prudence :*

I. In the first place, it is a spiritualised and supernatural instinct, which, when any act or course of action is contemplated, spontaneously decides whether such continuous or individual agency leads towards God, or leads away from God. It announces, almost infallibly, in the ordinary and every-day con-

1. Wisdom ;

SERMON

III.

cerns of life, what is good and what is bad ; what is right and what is wrong ; what ought to be done and what ought not to be done. It possesses a capacity for taking, from a Christian stand-point, as it were, a bird's-eye view of man's moral life. It perceives at a glance, as on a map or chart of human affairs, the boundaries and confines of sin, the shoals and quicksands of temptation, the rocks and headlands of downright wickedness. And these features come from that first element in the Virtue, which at once influences and is influenced by the other elements, and which we call, in the language of Holy Scripture—*Wisdom*.

2. *Judiciousness, in a threefold form :*

II. The first characteristic, then, of Christian Prudence, namely its Wisdom, having made a general survey of the whole course of a given action, the other component parts of this Cardinal Virtue have their functions called into play. The judicial element, then, of Prudence, which we term *Judiciousness*, in the second place, will be brought to bear upon human procedure. The temper of mind of which this quality is indicative, makes us consult well before we decide upon any line of action ; makes us design well before we undertake any work ; and makes

us weigh well each circumstance before we attempt its execution. *Sagacity, intelligence, and caution*, the threefold division of this side of Prudence, will here come in to help us in our judicial balancing; whilst the *Memory*, the first power of the mind to influence this Virtue, recalls the past to gain experience for the future. For instance—*Sagacity* will place us on our guard against possible dangers, probable pit-falls, and actual difficulties. *Intelligence* will point out what may assist us, who may co-operate with us, and which may be the best way to begin; what may be the fit time for action, how long we ought to continue to act, and when we must cease from acting. And the hard task-master, *caution*, will tend to keep us from false moves which are fatal when incurable; which consume valuable energy in the undoing and doing again, where it is possible; and which are only excusable when they are unavoidable. And this compound characteristic of Christian Prudence, we may term, as has been said, its Judiciousness.

SERMON
III.

*sagacity,
intelli-
gence, and
caution,*

*aided by the
memory.*

Sagacity.

*Intelli-
gence.*

Caution.

III. Wisdom and Judiciousness being thus assumed to form constituent parts of the Virtue of Prudence, we next come to the third quality, which distinguishes superna-

3. *Vigil-
ance, or
Careful-
ness,*

SERMON
III.

*aided by
the under-
standing.*

tural actions done under its guidance from works performed at the will and pleasure of mere human inclination, however elevated. This quality is *Vigilance* or *Carefulness*. And as Judiciousness was more nearly concerned with designs, before action is taken, in foreseeing, planning, and judging aright by anticipation ; so, in accomplishment, after action is begun, Vigilance will seek to execute worthily all that has been deemed worthy of execution. In this case, the *Understanding*, the second power of the mind, as before the Memory, co-operates with Prudence in considering things present ; in estimating the ways and means of action ; and in guiding aright its lines, that all may influence the issue.

4. *Perseverance in a threefold form :*

IV. The last element in Prudence of which I shall speak is *Perseverance*. This element, you will remember, found its exercise in the practical use of Fortitude. And this interdependence of the various features of the several Virtues is a fact which we discover over and over again, in action, as well as calculate upon in theory. It is, moreover, one which, though it makes the analysis of the Virtues more difficult, simplifies their practical developement, since one Virtue thoroughly mastered, not only gives us con-

fidence to attempt another, but also gives us positive power for success.

SERMON
III.

The grace of Perseverance, then, is no less needed for perfectibility in the Virtue of Fortitude than in that of Prudence. For, Wisdom in the general survey and constant supervision of any action ; Judiciousness in the plan of operation ; and Vigilance in working out the details, are of no permanent, or even temporary advantage, unsupported by the gift of Perseverance. A work conceived by genius, designed with ability, and elaborated with carefulness, is simply useless whilst still incomplete. Perseverance is that quality of Prudence which leads on a good cause from a good beginning to a good end.

And *firmness*, *diligence*, and *promptness* are almost essential ingredients in Perseverance.

The deed which is commenced at the time at which it should be half finished, if not wholly completed, loses the greater portion of its value and nearly all its merit : and

firmness,
diligence,
and
prompt-
ness.
Prompt-
ness.

promptness, therefore, is the soul of Perseverance. *Diligence*, also, finds its position in a work undertaken with Perseverance. Indeed, this latter element is the practical side of and co-relative to the former aspect of the Virtue before action is taken. For, however promptly we may have begun our labours,

Diligence.

SERMON
III.*Firmness.*

unless we be diligent after they are begun, there is no prospect of a satisfactory conclusion. Neither is *firmness* to be forgotten—and here again we meet with another speciality of Fortitude—in order to conquer difficulties which eagerness may too soon meet with, and assiduity alone may be powerless to surmount. And as the Memory and the Understanding were found to use their influence on the former phases of this Virtue ; so, in the due exercise of Perseverance, the *Will*, the third power of the mind, determines on future action, that it shall be energetic, with tenacious and inflexible purpose.

*The
Virtue is
aided by
the will.*

*Summary
of our
position.*

Let us now glance backward for a moment, and let us note the position in which we find ourselves placed in the examination of this Cardinal Virtue. The Virtue of Prudence, then, in the first place, is inspired with supernaturalised *Wisdom*, which influences human action in general ; and in the second place, is energised by the spiritual elements of *Judiciousness*, *Vigilance*, and *Perseverance*, which influence human action specifically. The Virtue also finds coadjutors in the three powers of the mind, the *Memory*, the *Understanding*, and the *Will*. It would be difficult

SERMON
III.

to discover, within the sphere of moral goodness, elements which more directly and definitely tend to the perfection of any given action, or course of action. Apart from the operation of the other Cardinal Virtues, that a deed energised by such influences would be absolutely perfect, may not, of course, be asserted. But in proportion as these agencies find their counterpart in practice, in the like proportion do the agents themselves tend to acquire holiness of life. And when holiness is attained, Fortitude, Justice, and Temperance can hardly be far distant from that phase of Prudence which can point for its parentage to Wisdom ; and can trace its descent through Judiciousness, before action is taken ; past Vigilance, when action is in progress ; down to Perseverance, until action be completed.

These Four Virtues, as it is well known, are termed *Cardinal*, from being the hinges or pivots on which, as from some firm basis, practical holiness may be made to turn. They are the foundation of the active life in the world, as distinct from the Theological Virtues which form the back-bone of the contemplative life in the cloister. Since they are held to be Cardinal, they must pre-

*The Cardinal Virtues
the basis of
the active
life.*

SERMON
III.

*The four
stages in
virtue,*

*of which we
have spoken
of one.*

*The second
stage in
virtue is
that of
Prudence.*

sumably be present with, and to a large extent be infused into each distinct act of godliness which aims at perfection. Every act of virtue, then, must bear the stamp of these four characteristics, to enable it to pass current as the coinage of the Great King. Over and above the mere natural instincts of duty, an act of holiness must be imbued, to a larger or less extent, with these four superhuman qualities—Fortitude, Prudence, Justice, and Temperance. In other words, in order to be perfect, an action must be supernaturally sober, supernaturally just, supernaturally wise, and supernaturally bold. We have seen, in the first place, that to raise any given action one degree above the effect of natural impulse, and to supply it to the same extent with supernatural character, the act must be done with Christian boldness. This is the first stamp, the stamp of boldness; and through the influence of the Cardinal Virtue, the bold deed becomes an act of Fortitude.

We are now in a position to ascend a stage higher. And in the second place, the courageous deed must be done with Christian Prudence. The absence of this gift, even in a natural form, spoils many an otherwise good work. It is not different with the supernatural grace. The bold action must be seasoned with discretion. And this Virtue

SERMON
III.

will tend to direct, limit, or intensify the other qualities by which we aim at perfection. The manner of its use we have seen. Prudence will curb all excess. It will supply all defects. It will judge of the best means to an end. It will decide, also, how to apply them. In order of time, Prudence is often the harbinger of Fortitude, before action is taken. It is also its guide, companion, friend, and helpmeet after action is begun. And its leading feature, in popular language, may be said to be, to ensure the right thing being done by the right person at the right time, by the right means, and in the right way. Prudence is therefore the second stamp which an action may acquire, and thus may be raised a second stage from natural goodness towards supernatural perfection. By this Virtue a worldly-wise action becomes an act of Prudence.

Now, as in the case of the Virtue of Fortitude, there are certain abstract propositions which hold good also of Prudence, so far as the exercise of the Virtue may be considered to be a substantative action, and not an influence pervading all the other Cardinal Virtues. I do not propose, however—as I warned you last Sunday—to discuss at length the three elements which constitute a perfect act of

*Abstract
proposi-
tions re-
viewed.*

SERMON
III.

Prudence, which you will recall by the words —1 the motive; 2 the law; and 3 the test. Neither will I enlarge upon the four conditions to be fulfilled in the exercise of Prudence, namely, that it be done 1 with full knowledge; 2 after free moral choice; 3 disinterestedly; and 4 upon principle. I shall also, of course, assume that we are capable of acting with Prudence; and that the Virtue is exercised perfectly when, if well done, it becomes an habitual state of action.

*The course
of a moral
action.*

I have summarised these propositions in the case of the Virtue we are considering in order to speak more at length of one other abstract question which on Sunday last we decided not to discuss, but which applies not only to Fortitude and Prudence, but to all the Cardinal Virtues. The question that we have to consider, may be termed *the course of a moral action*, which, when analysed, is found to consist of four integral parts. And these elements have a nearer affinity to Prudence, or rather, the Virtue of Prudence exercises a closer influence on these elements, than any of the other Virtues.

*Prelimi-
nary expla-
nations.*

Now the responsibility of an action is determined by the course which the action takes. And the four parts of which the

course consists depend upon the character of the action. Before, then, we can consider the course of an action, we must ascertain its character. And an action may possess one of two characters. It may be either Voluntary or Involuntary. Of acts that are Involuntary we need not speak much—for, unless the unwittingness of the action be caused by our own fault, or by a judgment upon us for sin, which is termed ‘judicial blindness,’ no responsibility attaches to an involuntary deed. Of actions, then, which are Involuntary, I will only say, first, that they are done either upon *compulsion*, or because of *ignorance*. Secondly, that *compulsion* is of two kinds: 1 Physical, in which the will of the doer is unconcerned; and 2 Moral, in which his will acts, but not freely, and hence is to be excused, or is inexcusable according to circumstances. Thirdly, that *ignorance* is only allowed to escape responsibility when, upon and after knowledge, sorrow is felt for the act ignorantly done; and is only allowed to plead absence of responsibility when the ignorance is not the result of the doer’s own fault.

SERMON
III.

*An action
may have
two charac-
ters.*

1. *Of in-
voluntary
action;*

We are now at liberty to discuss the four-fold course of a virtuous action, which is

2. *of action
that is*

SERMON
III.

*voluntary
and ad-
vised.*

*The four
phases of
moral
choice:*

1. *We*

wish;

2. *We*
deliberate;

3. *We*
decide;

4. *We*
will.

absolutely voluntary and has passed through a previous stage of consideration—two qualities to which, in practice, we assign a single term, *moral choice*. An act of Virtue, then, which is the result of Moral Choice, passes through four phases before its completion: 1. there is an *end* to be aimed at; 2. there is *consideration* as to the means; 3. there is a *choice* of means; and 4. there is the *will* to act upon. In short—We wish, we deliberate, we decide, and we will. Of these four elements, the Virtue of Prudence is more connected with the second and third divisions of the act, and is less connected with the first and fourth. In other words, Prudence is less concerned with the wish and the will of action; and more closely affects the consideration and choice of means. The Virtue of Temperance, perhaps, may influence the wish; and Fortitude certainly nerves the will. But Prudence is answerable, in its earlier forms of Wisdom and Judiciousness, for the consideration of the means before an action is begun. Whilst, after deliberation has been taken, and when decision as to choice comes into play, Vigilance and Perseverance perform their functions in the many-sided action, as the later forms of this Cardinal Virtue.

SERMON
III.

Consideration as to the means of action.

Judiciousness is the middle term between thoughtlessness and timidity.

Of these divisions in the course of an action which may be termed virtuous, let us take one for further analysis. And we will select the second of the four, namely, *consideration as to the means*, and how it is influenced by that element of Prudence which we call Judiciousness. This will also enable us to consider how the 'law,' of which I spoke on Sunday last, as an element of perfection, may be seen to apply also to this Cardinal Virtue—the law I mean of the 'mean,' or middle term, between its excess and defect. Now Judiciousness in considering the means of action stands mid-way between two extremes, the one of which results in accelerating action without thought, the other of which tends to impede action by over much thought. The last of these extremes, which tends towards and often ends in *timidity*—*viz.*, Over-caution—betokens incapacity because of indecision. The former, which we term *thoughtlessness*, ensures incompetence by reason of a want of consideration. Both are baneful with regard to virtuous action. And the true mean between Thoughtlessness and Timidity is to be found only in the Judicious element of the Virtue of Prudence.

There is indeed another triad of moral forces, in which Judiciousness again stands as *It is also the mean between two*

SERMON
III.

other extremes.

the happy medium, which perhaps it may be well to notice, and only to notice in order to pass by. In this case the excess and defect are caused by a want, either of intellectual power denied by nature, or of moral power incapacitated by sin. But both are called by one name, *folly*—the Folly of him who lacks understanding, whom, as the sufferer from God's Divine Judgments, we pity; and the Folly of the fool who is wise in his own conceit, whom, as the sufferer from his own weakness, we despise.

The deficiency, average, and exaggeration of Prudence.

The deficiency, the average, and the exaggeration in the case of this development of Prudence, in order to impress them on our minds, I will repeat. They are these:—Thoughtlessness is the defect. Judiciousness is the mean. Timidity is the excess. The value of the mean may be perceived from the danger attending the use of the two extremes. For both the extremes are injurious to moral action. They are injurious, but in opposite ways, and not to the same extent. And the middle term, a Judicious consideration of the means of action, is the only course to be safely followed. Not to the same extent, I say. For though Over-caution, or Timidity, may hinder our advance in holiness, though it may become a clog on our good works,

though it may cause us to suffer the loss of gain—yet, the evils that it inflicts upon our spiritual condition are incomparable to the ills which come into the world simply by the unaided help of Thoughtlessness. So utterly mischievous, even with the best intentions to many persons, is this unmanageable, this almost unconquerable fault, that perhaps more sorrow, more suffering, even more wickedness are caused by want of thought than by malicious and deliberate sin. The word spoken in haste—thoughtlessly—which can never be unsaid, nor explained away ; the deed done on the spur of the moment—thoughtlessly—which may never be undone, or acted over again ; the wish conceived with greater speed than either, which, without time for proverbial ‘second thoughts,’ thoughtlessly passes beyond our control by act or word, for ever : all these are caused by this only not vicious propensity. The consequences that arise, which we did not foresee ; the results that follow, which we could not imagine ; the end that comes, which we may not escape : these, my Brethren, these all endanger our eternal welfare, through the influence of that one besetting sin, which its victims at once, and its agents palliate by the harmless term of Thoughtlessness, but which are caused

SERMON
III.

*Thought-
lessness.*

SERMON
III.

either by the violation, or by the neglect, of one important phase of the Cardinal Virtue of Prudence.

*Prudence
viewed
practically.*

Let us now take, more exclusively, a practical view of the Virtue of Prudence.

*Repetition
of the
results
attained in
the Sermon
on Forti-
tude.*

Last Sunday morning, whilst considering the Virtue of Fortitude, I led your thoughts to a certain phase of every-day and family life, on which I desire again to speak a few words, whilst advocating the exercise of Christian Prudence. You may remember, or at all events I will repeat, that we considered together the case of an adult Catholic, living in a family circle, in which he was subjected to conscientious opposition, in matters of faith and duty. We noted certain causes of opposition; and we saw, that, whilst some had a show of reason, and upon others there might fairly be diversity of opinion, there was yet a distinct balance on the Catholic side, the opposition to which was not only absurd, but anti-Christian. Moreover, we found a law, by which we might guide our course of action. We found that Catholic usages divided themselves into three classes—1 those that are *essential*, which must be done, at all hazards of giving offence; 2 those that are

SERMON
III.

edifying, which may be done, if no scandal ensue ; 3 those that are *indifferent*, about which, if scandal or offence be caused, our director should be consulted, and his advice should be followed. Obedience was claimed for the observance of these simple rules, on the score of Christian Fortitude. But, I warned you before, and shall attempt to show you now, that whilst Fortitude enforced obedience, yet, that Prudence would make such conformity less antagonistic. And to this point I desire your attention.

If we turn back in thought to the definition of Prudence which I attempted to give at the outset, we shall perceive how, and in what manner, and to what extent Prudence may aspire to be the supplementary Virtue to Fortitude in such a case as this. We found that the Cardinal Virtue consisted of these four constituent parts—*Wisdom*, as the all-pervading, ever-influencing instinct which watches over human agency generally ; with the subordinate qualities of *Judiciousness*, *Vigilance*, and *Perseverance*, which, in particular, are to be exercised as occasion offers or as need demands. It is not too much to hope, if not to expect, that an act, or a course of action, which is undertaken by Fortitude,

Restatement of the elements of Prudence ; and how they may be exercised in the case supposed.

SERMON
III.

and is continued under the supervision of this sharp-sighted, many-headed Virtue must, in the end, disarm opposition, even if it secure not positive support. I shall consider these four elements of Prudence in the inverse order in which they have been named—but only in a short and suggestive manner.

How Perseverance may influence others in the every-day life of a Catholic :

I. considered generally in family life ;

I. In the first place, as to *Perseverance*. This quality I earnestly urge upon you to cultivate, not only for its own worth, which ought to be enough for us ; but also, because in this fickle, superficial age, few moral virtues are so telling on those without as Perseverance. And the general law which this follows will have its influence in the special case we are considering. For, it is hard to say what opposition in family life may not be lived down, through the virtue of Perseverance, by the sheer force of its own inert vitality. Let a man be as utterly devoid of any hold on the other elements of Prudence as you will ; let him be as uncareful, as injudicious, as unwise as can be conceived, if only he perseveres long enough, he is fairly certain to obtain his end—and his end in the social circle is, toleration. There is an unanswerable argument with the world in perseverance, which it cannot withstand—and the family is

but a segment of the world's circle in miniature. Perseverance, dull, honest, patient, stolid Perseverance is so unlike the world's languid view of all that ministers not to novelty, excitement, or change, that it is fain to believe Perseverance to be virtuous, and hence to be tolerated, because respectable. And however much the world dislikes virtue for its own use, it loves the virtue in others, which it takes for respectability. The persevering man, therefore, in the end, leads the world captive, and conquers the world in the family circle. And if this be true of the world, in a worldly point of view, how much more is it true of the Church, in a Catholic.

But, this is not all that may be said. No work which in its nature is not spasmodic, no work which possesses any element of continuity, will or can prosper, before GOD or man, without the exercise of Perseverance. But, short of this evident proposition, there is an evil connected with the absence of Perseverance in the daily and family life of Catholics which is simply calamitous. Any one who will be at the pains to call to mind the details of the lives of others, of which he may have the opportunity for observation; and still better—though here his observation will be less keen—any one who calls to mind the

SERMON
III.

2. *considered
specifically
in our own
lives, and
in the lives
of others.*

SERMON
III.

*Want of
Perseverance
wide-
spread;*

details of his own life, at some period of his subjection to the Catholic Revival, will acknowledge this fact—If there be one cause more than another which gives offence in the daily concerns of family life, and which makes Catholic customs to be lightly esteemed of the world, it is the want of Perseverance which some Catholics display. A dilettante spirit pervades much of modern religious Society. Æsthetic fancies, and sentimental longings take possession of one portion. Unreal eccentricities and playing at religion pervades another part. Neither make full use of the means of Grace within their reach; and both employ them but for a time. Many are the ways in which an absence of Perseverance has become almost a note of professing Catholics, so widely has the poison spread, in this age of feverish excitement and ever-restless activity. In order, however, that we may not escape the sting of conscience in merely passing through a cloud of vague generalities—for who is there amongst us, who sins not in some form against this phase of the Virtue of Prudence?—that we may not escape, I say, the sting of conscience, I shall place before you certain points in which it is at least possible that you, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, may have sinned against Perseverance. If you

have not so sinned, give GOD the glory ; offer Him thanks ; be humble, lest you fall hereafter ; and beg for grace still to persevere even unto the end. If you have sinned in any of the ways I shall name, confess the same to GOD at once ; mention it at your next confession to GOD's Priest ; and in GOD's Presence now shortly to be manifested on His Altar, make your adoring supplication that you may persevere more perfectly for the future.

SERMON
III.

*and its
partial
remedy.*

If, however, I speak at all, I must speak plainly. And I will mention instances of want of Perseverance, most, if not all the cases, of which have come under my own personal observation. For example :—The Sacrament of Confession is adopted as a fancy—let the fancy take the form either of sentiment, or of fashion, or even of actual need : and Confession is abandoned when the need is supposed to be satisfied, when the fashion is thought to be passed, when the sentiment has actually subsided. The sign of the holy Cross is used, incontinently, almost savagely, used at one time : and then, as unreasonably, is not used at all. Retreats are tried once, and once only : the experiment is not repeated, though they form a part of the ordinary spiritual life of many

*Instances
of want
of Perse-
verance :*

1. *Confes-
sion ;*

2. *sign of
the Cross ;*

3. *retreats ;*

SERMON
III.

4. *genu-
flexions ;*

5. *fasting
and absti-
nence ;*

6. *the
Hours ;*

7. *prostra-
tion ;*

8. *devo-
tional
reading ;*

9. *Reli-
gious
Societies ;*

10. *wor-
ship.*

devout persons. Genuflexions are made to the Altar, when the Sacred Presence is not there—which is more than is needful : and then, bye-and-bye, the head is not so much as bowed in passing GOD's earthly Tabernacle—which is certainly less. One year Advent is kept as strictly as Lent ought to be observed, or Fridays are kept as fasts : another year, abstinence is not practised on Fridays, and Lent is not observed, even with the self-denial suitable for Advent. The Canonical Hours are thought to be the climax of ordinary devotion at one period of life : at another, mid-day prayer, which is of much importance, said even in the midst of business, is permanently intermitted. Prostration at the Altar, which is unseemly to others, dangerous in the case of the Chalice, consumptive of time, inconvenient to the minister, and a source of self-consciousness to the person who performs it—is held to be indispensable to-day, and a matter of indifference to-morrow. Devotional books are begun ; but are only begun, to be laid aside, half read, for some other, and still newer issue from the ever-fertile press. Societies are joined, whose obligations are never systematically observed, whose meetings are seldom attended, whose funds languish, and whose intentions are ignored. One Church

after another is worshipped in, and thought perfection at first ; then, is attended but seldom, and criticised afterwards ; finally, is abandoned, if not abused.

SERMON
III.

It is the same with private devotions and rules of life. It is the same with public services. It is the same with confessors, directors, spiritual advisers, spiritual friends. It is the same with acts, and words, and thoughts, and mental promises, and promises to God which are only not vows, known only to God and the soul. It is the same, lastly, even with the Communion in which God has placed these victims of a want of perseverance—aye, my Brethren, it is the same with the Communion of their own seeking. Nor do I here venture to judge those earnest men who have deliberately come to the conclusion, that, in order to ensure the salvation of their souls, they must leave us. Judgment should not be lightly passed on these in a single sentence. But I do take upon me to reiterate the judgment which others of a very different class of mind, by their own wilful and foolish act, have passed upon themselves. For cases have been frequent, in which persons, both Priests and laymen, have committed one blunder in leaving, to use a figure of speech, the Church of their baptism, and then, in a

*Various
other in-
stances of
want of
Perse-
verance ;*

*specially in
a change of
Church
obedience.*

SERMON
III.

short time—a few weeks or months, or even years—have incontinently committed another and worse blunder in leaving, to speak literally, the Church of their choice.

*Summary:
the result
of want
of Perse-
verance.*

But why multiply instances? Every one who observes can see, how ideas are entertained and cast aside ; how practices are acted on and intermitted ; how belief and usage are boasted of and then contemned or disesteemed with a levity and heartlessness painful to contemplate. Neither sex is free from blame. The frivolities of those whom the Apostle calls ‘silly women,’ and the affectations of the still more foolish young men, are the bane of the Catholic School. It is impossible that their inconsistencies are overlooked ; or that being observed, fail to influence others against the Movement. Their want of perseverance does more harm to the cause than any good these actors could ever, or ever will, perform. And in the particular case we are contemplating—daily family life—their vacillations afford colour to the opposition which they have evoked, and indefinitely postpone the hope of opposition being conquered, which they desire.

*How Vigil-
ance may*

II. The way in which *Vigilance* works on our behalf in winning over our friends to

SERMON
III.

Catholic truth, I will not much insist on. Carefulness and exactness in all that we do ; doing all that we may in the best possible manner ; doing all that we do, to prevent the undoing and doing again ; taking as much care for the details when the plan is settled, as we took for the design before either were conceived ; making the glory of GOD our standard, as well as our motive, or being wishful to do so, in all that we perform—such evidences of Vigilance will bear with them their own commendation, and will produce their own effect in moderating the opposition which our Fortitude has entailed, but which our Perseverance has to some extent diminished.

*gain us
support
from our
friends.*

III. Neither will the due exercise of the last subordinate feature of Prudence fail to work its way towards success. *Judiciousness* will enable us to avoid possible dangers ; to turn difficulties into means of co-operation ; to make supports out of impediments ; and to surmount, or pass by, obstacles which cannot be avoided, or be left unnoticed. This side of Prudence, in its three-fold form, Sagacity, Intelligence, and Caution, will help us largely in possible opposition in domestic life. For it will ensure a cautious temper not

*How Judiciousness
may tend
to lessen
family
opposition ;
specially in
the use*

*I. of cau-
tion,*

SERMON
III.

2. of in-
telligence,

to overdo good works which are not essential ; not to be zealous overmuch in matters which call but for little zeal ; not to be exacting in trifles ; punctilious in things of slight honour ; self-important where little dignity is involved ; critical towards the shortcomings of others, and blind to defects and faults in ourselves. These things *caution* will effect. *Intelligence* will effect more ; and amongst other things will teach us the difficult task of virtuous moral action, how most to benefit others with the least danger to our own soul.

3. of *saga-*
city.

Whilst *sagacity* will insure our doing the right thing in the right manner and at the right time, and will give us that unfailing power of attraction which results from Christian courtesy, and the power of doing unpleasant things in the pleasantest of ways.

How Wis-
dom will
crown all
our efforts.

IV. But, perhaps, there is no moral quality which is so likely to extort acceptance from unwilling beholders for a judicious, vigilant, persevering action as the additional element of *Wisdom*. In many ways this is a rationalistic age ; and the 'wherefore' is one influence, and often an important influence, with men in either conforming to, or dissenting from, that to which they are not accustomed. Of course, I place vulgar prejudice

SERMON
III.

out of sight. Yet, even with prejudiced persons, a wise course of action often silences where it does not persuade, and sometimes conforms where it does not convince. But with all others, how much does not an atmosphere of wisdom, with which our actions are seen to be animated, tend to their ultimate acceptance! If it can be affirmed that a course is pursued upon some intelligible and intelligent motive, it at once bespeaks a hearing for itself, from all reasonable persons. If this motive be seen to be conducted with moderation, with a care for others' feelings, without self-seeking, at personal cost and sacrifice, simply as an act of duty, and in obedience, even to authority not acknowledged by the world—the practical Wisdom which such conduct displays will eventually overcome even domestic and family opposition.

These hints on Christian Prudence I now *Conclusion,* commend to your attention, and shall leave you to work out for yourselves. An act performed under the general influence of Wisdom; commenced in the temper of Judiciousness; carried on under the spur of Vigilance; and completed with the steadfastness of Perseverance, will comprise many of the elements of perfectibility. A course of action

SERMON. based on this individual act of Prudence,
III. which has been energised by the vigour of
Fortitude, which has been guided by the balance of Justice, and which has been checked by the curb of Temperance—such a course of action will become absolutely perfect.

A. M. D. G.

Sermon IV.

JUSTICE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues : for she teacheth Justice.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

THE Cardinal Virtue of Justice finds its exercise in three distinct ways:—1. Justice towards ourself : 2. Justice towards our neighbour : 3. Justice towards our God.

SERMON
IV.

Justice is exercised in a threefold way ; of which the first two may be treated practically.

With a view to the practical details of our every-day life as Catholics, we will chiefly confine our attention to the first two of these three ways. And perhaps the better form in which to discuss these phases of Justice will be, to show how, and in what manner both of them work in practice, ere we attempt to find exact definitions for either. Suffer me then, without further preface, to enter upon the consideration before us.

In the first place, I must say a few words upon the exercise of this Virtue towards

Justice towards God is

SERMON
IV.

*corelative
with Jus-
tice towards
man ;*

GOD. Justice towards GOD on the one hand, and on the other Justice towards our neighbour and ourself, are co-ordinate virtues, and from a Catholic point of view are mutually interdependent. For, Justice towards the Creator involves of necessity, in its developement, Justice towards the created works of His Almighty Hand : and Justice towards man is at once incomplete without, and also attains its highest perfection in, Justice towards GOD. If it is important to be just to our neighbour, if it is needful to be just to ourselves, it is essential to be just to our GOD. The way in which Justice towards GOD may be exercised by His creatures is manifold. For example—by the conformity of the human will to the Will Divine ; by the dedication of our persons to our Sovereign LORD and Master ; by the payment of our dues in time, in money, or in service to His worship, His poor, and His Church ; by the surrender of our souls to His revelation here, and to His judgment hereafter, as to the teaching of One Who cannot deceive and to the sentence of One Who will not unjustly judge.

*It is based
upon defi-
nite belief,
and calls*

Justice towards GOD, then, is based on a very definite belief, the denial of which would shake to its foundations the Christian

SERMON
IV.

*for definite
practice:*

the belief;

*the prac-
tice,*

1. *in act,*

2. *in word.*

Faith. It is also applied in practice in so definite a manner, that to ignore its claims would be to abandon our title to be considered as children of GOD. There are many ways in which this Virtue may be exercised in either form. I shall mention but one, which is of the utmost importance in this latitudinarian age, and which combines both. Justice towards GOD involves at once practice and belief. The belief begets in our souls an overpowering sense of the absolute and infinite Justice of the Almighty; an awe-inspiring realisation that our GOD is not only a GOD of Love, a GOD of Truth, a GOD of Mercy, and a GOD of Compassion, but also a GOD of Justice. The practice consequent on this belief is twofold: and may be shown forth in word and deed. In deed, we must boldly act up to our faith in GOD's absolute and infinite Justice. In word, we must not be ashamed to confess, at certain times, and when necessity demands, our belief. We must not hesitate to avow our conviction in GOD's Justice, that it is invariable and certain; that it is immutable and changeless; that it is sometimes unaccountable, and oftentimes unexpected; that it is, humanly speaking, compensative and retaliative, or, in

SERMON
IV.

One practical result of our belief in God's Justice is to support the teaching and use of the Athanasian Creed;

theological terms, that GOD'S Justice is retributive or vindictive.

Neither must we fail to do all we may to uphold what we believe to be true. And as a very practical way of actively attesting our belief in this awful truth, at the present time, I would urge upon you to oppose, each in your own sphere of action, by argument, example, word and deed, the attack which is now being made on the venerable Formula of Faith which is called the Athanasian Creed. At the present moment an agitation is in existence, which if successful will practically eliminate that Creed from both our public worship and our doctrinal standards. The agitation takes two forms—the more honest and boldest would cast out the clauses, flip-pantly yet truly termed, ‘damnatory:’ the less honest and weakest would make the recitation of the Creed permissive in the place of obligatory. Spurious philanthropy and a false charity—neither of them Christian—on the part of a few Priests of sceptical opinions, and more laymen of no definitive opinions on the positive side whatever, are the fomenting causes of this agitation. I earnestly exhort you, my Brethren, to show forth your practical belief in the absolute Justice of GOD by upholding, by all means

in your power, the authority and use of this Catholic declaration of faith. And I urge you to this end on these three grounds—
 1. Because even the objectors to its use dare not question the truth of the dogmatic statements in the Creed : 2. Because Catholic consent has set its seal upon the Creed : 3. Because, after all that has been said of the Creed, there are no valid reasons to make us doubt that the ‘damnatory clauses’ are, in effect, the very words of our Blessed LORD Himself.

SERMON
IV.

*on three
grounds.*
I.

2.

3.

I. We are now in a position to turn to the first question which demands our attention—*Justice towards our neighbour.* And the guiding principle of this phase of the Cardinal Virtue we are considering is the old fashioned, child-taught lesson, ‘To do unto all men as we would they should do unto us.’ Its exercise involves us in a constant disposition to give to our neighbour his due—be such neighbour our inferior, equal, or better. It teaches us also how to keep in check every thought and word, each desire and judgment, all bodily or mental action which may inflict or tend to inflict injury, pain, distress, or harm upon others. And the way I shall endeavour to place before you the everyday

*Justice to-
wards our
neighbour :
its prin-
ciple,*

*and its
exercise,*

*set forth
from one
example—*

SERMON
IV.

*theological
controversy*

working of this Virtue, is to take, from the many views which might be taken of this wide subject, one point which will combine both the active and passive sides of Justice—the doing and the not doing as we ought towards our neighbour. And the point I shall take is this—Justice to our neighbour in matters of theological controversy.

*Justice is
afforded to
opponents
in other
questions.*

Perhaps in no questions which agitate the intellectual portion of mankind—if we except family feuds—do persons stand so much in need of warning to cultivate an equitable disposition as in this. Certainly in none is Justice so often and so harshly denied. In Parliament, at the Bar, on Military matters, on Scientific or Social subjects, in Art, in Letters—in all these divisions of human thought, men are wont to argue, to criticise, to object, to condemn. Yet, in all of them an adversary is less uncertain to obtain a meed of Justice than in theological polemics. Of course, it must not be forgotten that, to the same extent to which the subject of discussion is either important or absorbing, to the same extent will men's hearts be stirred. The deeper may flow their convictions, the less completely will their passions be kept under command. And in this aspect, family

quarrels, which most nearly touch our affections, and dogmatic differences, which most nearly concern our souls, are in unwonted harmony. But this only partially explains results that we all deplore. The fact remains, that Justice is hard to secure, and is seldom extorted, from a theological opponent.

Now, in such a case as this, I may, perhaps, be allowed to apply a line of argument to Catholics, which if applied by others to themselves might be considered self-conscious. We, my Brethren, of all persons can afford to be just; because we, as Catholics, hold in its completeness the Catholic Faith. If we held anything short of the Catholic Faith in its entirety, I could understand, though—observe—I should not defend, the policy of injustice. I could understand the policy of stating an adversary's views a little short of the truth; or of adding to his opinions a little more than he holds. I could understand the policy of showing, without hesitation, that his premises lead whither he denies that they lead; or of proving, beyond a doubt, that his conclusions land him where he objects to be disembarked. I could understand the policy of forcing him to accept a doctrine to which he declines to assent; or to deny a mystery

SERMON
IV.

*How
Catholics
may view
Justice to
theological
opponents.*

*Special
pleading
common
in religious
contro-
versy;*

SERMON
IV.

but is unworthy of a Catholic.

which he has no intention to disavow. I could understand, lastly, the policy of closing the argument with an authority from Holy Scripture, Tradition, the Fathers, or Ecclesiastical History which just escapes conclusiveness. I could understand, I repeat, all such special pleading in any one but a Catholic. In such an one, such conduct is as far beneath his own moral dignity, as it falls short of absolute truthfulness, to lower the tone of his argument, or to debase the standard of Justice on theological subjects by such polemical devices.

Two rules by which we may avoid controversial injustice.

The way in which, of set purpose, I have stated them, will suggest the method by which we may avoid these divergences from the standard of stern Justice towards our neighbour in theological controversy. I will add, that I have taken examples from the manner in which popular speakers, or popular writers, are wont to discuss Catholic doctrines from a Protestant stand-point. But I have not been specific in these examples. In order then to make my meaning more plain, I will venture to lay down two laws, which, in general, will tend to keep us clear from controversial injustice in the case of any individual person. *Firstly*—Never affirm of an opponent that, because he holds one

I. *Never make an opponent either affirm,*

SERMON
IV.

dogma, he must of necessity hold another dogma, which, in your opinion, is the legitimate outcome of the former. And *Secondly*—Never force an opponent to deny any given truth, because he willingly denies some other given truth; both being, in your opinion again, co-ordinate revelations.

2. *or deny a truth co-ordinate to those that he holds or denies.*

These laws may be difficult always to adhere to. It is far more easy to be self-confident, or severe, or sarcastic, or pungent in controversy, than to be just, considerate, and diffident. It is also more easy to see one side of a statement—and that our own version of it—than both sides of a question—one of which is that of our adversary. Nor must we forget, apart from one exception to be mentioned, that in argument we simply, as a rule, meet opinion with opinion, and private judgment with private judgment; and that, to say the least, our neighbour's opinion and private judgment are to be held in equal estimation with our own. There will, however, be ample scope in theological discussions, for our argumentative faculties, even when we are content to abide by these not over-exacting conditions of controversy. And I have qualified their invariable use by the terms employed—in *general*, for cases may arise in which the opposite is the better

These rules, in themselves fair, are to be used,

1. *in general, but not invariably;*

SERMON
IV.

2. *towards
persons,
not towards
opinions.*

course to be adopted: and an *individual person*, for we are not bound, but exactly the opposite, we are bound not to consider false principles, in the abstract, with the tenderness we are called on to show to the persons who accept them.

*One excep-
tion; where
the Church
has spoken.*

To these two laws I know of only one exception—to which I have alluded—the case in which the Church has spoken, and has thus anticipated human judgment, either negatively or affirmatively. Here, whether the matter be decided definitely by Creed or Council, or acted on practically by the equally clear authority of Catholic and Universal consent, we are bound—we are bound, be the consequences what they may, to hold or to deny whatever the Church has declared or has disavowed. But, short of this, short of an opinion which has the authority of the Church (and which, hence, ceases to be an opinion), it is not at all wise, and it may be very far from charitable to attempt to impale an adversary on the horns of a theological dilemma. There is every chance, under favourable circumstances, if private judgment alone is either guide or standard, and if such arguments and assertions as I have suggested are only made with sufficient persistency and forcibly enough—there is every chance, I

SERMON
IV.

repeat, of driving the opponent either out of the Church, or into disbelief. But save in exceptional cases, they will never make a Catholic of him.

Nor is this all that may be said. It is more than possible, although the line of argument adopted may be perfectly true in itself and generally; yet, that it may be perfectly false in particular, and as applied to the controversial adversary in question. Few men's minds are absolutely logical: and the temper in which most men are wont to argue intensifies the evil consequent on their lack of logical power. It may be, that a soft answer, with an ejaculatory prayer to God, will turn away the anger for which ourselves may be in part responsible. It may be, that the inconsistency which we so plainly perceive and so deeply deplore, will become, by the mercy of God, the very point at which, at some future day, the Brother or Sister may turn and accept God's Truth in its blessed entirety. But whether or not either of these much desired contingencies occur, we must pause—we must pause ere we presume to climb up, unbidden, into the seat of Judgment, and in thus condemning our neighbour, ourselves offend against the Cardinal Virtue of Justice.

The opposite line may be true in principle, but false in practice;

and must not be adopted by Catholics.

SERMON
IV.
—*Results of
acting upon
these laws.*

Such is one of many ways in which we may exercise Justice towards our neighbour. And these hints may be acted upon with advantage when, against our will, we are forced into controversy, in the everyday family life of Catholics. *Forced*, I say : for there is nothing which a Catholic so instinctively shrinks from as unadvised, light, flippant, almost profane disputes upon the deepest mysteries of Faith in the mixed society of social gatherings ; or in the smaller, more private, and consequently less reserved meetings of the family circle. Disputes on the Faith, however, at certain times and under certain conditions, a Catholic is bound to enter into : and they will become less uncharitable, less bitter, less intolerant by the use of the mollifying measures I have attempted to indicate. That they will be accepted by others on behalf of ourselves is to be hoped for only on one condition, that we are content to adopt them ourselves on behalf of others. But we must neither hope, nor wait, for this result. We must abide our time ; and whatever we are called upon to suffer at the hands of others, in polemical discussions, we must never hesitate to be just to our neighbour, nor to leave the issue

of such contentions on behalf of His Truth in the hands of the Almighty Judge of all.

SERMON
IV.

II. *Justice towards ourselves* may be found in the happy medium between two extremes, both of which are powerfully self-attracting, but in neither of which alone may perfectibility be found. On the one hand, it is an absolute truth that we were sent into this world for a single purpose, which bears the double aspect of GOD's glory and our own salvation—for GOD has been pleased to make the salvability of man the measure of His own infinite glory. This is the first extreme of which I spoke: and its tendency is towards religious selfishness. On the other hand, the second extreme is antagonistic to this: and its tendency is towards forgetfulness of self in thought for others. It is based upon the principle, that when one member suffers, all the members suffer with it. It acts upon the practice of being willing and anxious to spend, and to be spent, for others. Justice to ourselves, therefore, occupies the middle space between these divergent and opposing influences. It has to steer between the sand-bank of selfishness, and the whirlpool of forgetfulness of self. It must skilfully escape

Justice towards ourselves, lying between the extremes of
1. *selfishness,*

and 2. of forgetfulness of self,

is the virtuous 'mean' to be cultivated.

SERMON
IV.

neglect of one's own soul, in ceaselessly ministering to the souls and bodies of others.

*This side of
Justice
difficult to
cultivate.*

It does not seem at first sight, as if, in an age of which one main characteristic is selfishness, that there was much danger to Catholics in not doing justice to themselves. But, under the present conditions of modern society, this side of Justice is no easy Virtue to acquire. We have seen that its exercise lies midway between religious selfishness, and what may be termed, without figure of speech, religious dissipation. Of these two opposite departures from the golden mean of Justice to ourselves, perhaps the most common, and I will say, the most excusable, in such an age as this, is religious dissipation. Certainly, the least excusable of the two, and I will add, the most contemptible, is *religious selfishness*.

*Religious
selfishness,
the worst
form of the
two ex-
tremes.*

Of all the forms of this anti-Christian of vices, the form which makes our own salvation, apart from the good of our fellow-men, and apart from the glory of God, our one sole thought, aim, and desire—this is the worst. There is a want of manliness, there is a want of generosity, there is a want of high-mindedness and of chivalry, about religious selfishness, which ensures the disavowal even of the world. And so un-

worthy a motive of action will never merit Heaven : for selfishness in religion could not be influenced by the love of GOD—and the love of GOD alone may make us worthy to win the Beatific Vision.

SERMON
IV.

But, if religious selfishness may not merit the Vision of GOD, neither can we hope to attain thereto if the sister sin be not equally avoided, namely, *religious dissipation*. To this other danger, I desire to lead your thoughts more at length. Religious dissipation is at once a deceptive and an ensnaring form of worldliness. For it is a sad mistake to suppose that no element of worldliness may lie hid beneath the semblance of religious devotion, however anomalous may be the combination. And what are we to understand by this kind of dissipation? It is not so unfamiliar that it is hard to be described. I will mention one aspect which will, perhaps, at once suggest others and commend itself to your minds. In these days it takes the form of undue eagerness, restlessness, over anxiety, and even fussiness, about all religious questions of the day which minister, mark you, my Brethren, not to any deepening of the inner Christian life, but to the excitement of the mere outer and worldly life of the Catholic.

*Religious
dissipation,*

*a form of
worldli-
ness,*

*described
under one
aspect.*

SERMON
IV.

It is not that these matters of excitement, in themselves, are worthless. On the contrary, they are, in general, worthy of all commendation. They only become acts of injustice when they absorb, instead of interest; when they are made the rule of life, instead of the exception; when, instead of edifying, they dissipate.

*Causes of
dissipation:
I. Religious
societies.*

For instance:—Take one fruitful cause of dissipation—the multiplication of *Religious Societies*. The number of Religious Societies which exist almost defy classification, and hardly admit of being counted. I shall not, however, allude to Societies with a practical, definite aim, worked by religious or seculars, such as Sisterhoods, Orphanages, or Homes. These are beyond hostile criticism. Neither shall I refer to Parochial Guilds and Brotherhoods. Of their establishment the parish Priest is a competent judge; and—if I may offer an opinion—I consider them to be most useful. But I speak of Societies, neither parochial nor conventual in character, which, even if they have a definite intention, can scarcely be commended for utility, and are almost to be condemned, either for overstepping the domains, or for clashing with the objects of some earlier and well-established Society. Nor do I speak at hazard, though it is useless to be definite. What may be the

*In the establishment
of new
societies,
dissipation
is inevitable;*

SERMON
IV.

fate of these mushroom organisms it is difficult to say. They make but little public show after their first start—unless it be by an appeal for funds. Possibly, their energy was expended in the enthusiasm of origination. Meanwhile, however, the labour, which was futile for good, has succeeded in causing religious dissipation to all who have become entangled in the enterprise or involved in the failure : and many are they who have cause to lament over energy, zeal, and devotion misapplied in acquiring only injustice to their own souls.

The case of the older Religious Societies is different. By their consistency in doing God's work in their several spheres they have a claim upon our sympathy, our support, and our prayers. But in their practical working, however holy may be the cause—and the same is observable, also, in all matters of parish organisation—there is a tendency, I do not say more, but there is a tendency towards dissipation, in all but very devout minds, or highly spiritualised persons. For, the ordinary practical labours connected with the legitimate working of these bodies are heavy ; and few are they, amongst Churchmen, who are not connected with one or more of these Societies and their management. The time

and in the working of all societies there is a tendency to the same.

SERMON
IV.

devoted to the prayers for the special intention of each Society, which are more or less of obligation, in the case of many such calls, is a heavy tax upon our energy. Whilst the meetings of the parent Society, its council, its committees ; the reading, signing, and circulation of its letters, appeals, protests, and declarations ; the begging for, or collection of funds ; and other similar work of a secular character, leave but little time, under ordinary circumstances, for the concerns of one's own soul. And hence, there is a tendency to religious dissipation.

2. *Religious
newspapers
and perio-
dicals.*

Take another case. Take the case of *Religious Newspapers and Periodicals*. Here, again, the use of this mode for the interchange of thought, and the circulation of fact and opinion, amongst Catholics, has a legitimate use and possesses much value. It is only against the abuse of the principle, that I venture to utter a word of friendly warning, lest, by the over-much use of what is good in itself, dissipation, and hence injustice to ourselves should ensue. But even the legitimate use of this method of educating public opinion Church-wards has its drawbacks. Those whose position necessitates the reading, on both sides, these many titled issues from the

press, know to their cost how hard is the imposed task, and how profitless unutterable.

SERMON
IV.

The number of papers or serials which, with more or less cause, claim the support of Churchmen, or which in a greater or less degree, are hostile to the Catholic Revival is large. Perhaps it is over-large ; for few years pass without the disappearance, absorption, or change of one or more of these periodicals which appeal only to class circulation. But the number is so large, that one of two events is constantly happening—sometimes both occur.

The number of serials friendly or hostile to the cause :

The broad sheet, or the tale of pages, has intermittently to be filled, by a certain time, at any cost. But the supply of genuine news, healthy thought, sound criticism, or legitimate complain is limited, and does not always flow in proportion to the demand. Whose fault this may be, in the case of our own journals, I stay not to inquire : nor is it important to my argument. It is more than possible, that the Catholic party do not give a fair proportion of brain power towards, as they are loudly and perhaps justly accused of starving the monetary supplies of, the literary organs of the Movement. Still, the result is the same. Either one sees the identical paragraph, novelty, event, lamentation, or Church scandal repeated over and over again

their requirements,

and how satisfied.

SERMON
IV.

in each succeeding paper ; or letters, be they signed or anonymous, are inserted the tone of which is oftentimes positively a disgrace to the cause.

*Letter-
writing in
papers, and
its abuse.*

This system of letter-writing bids fair to become, if it has not already become, a serious nuisance. Almost each person in turn is compelled to enter the lists, either in self-defence, or in defence of what he holds dearer than self. For letters containing both doubts and denials of Catholic dogma or Catholic discipline, whose authors are either unknown, or known mainly for undisciplined self-will in private judgment, are continually appearing. That such letters should have been allowed to appear in print, I do not hesitate to affirm, is—from a Catholic point of view—a gross violation of editorial liberty. The publicity which press circulation ensures, and which nothing else would have secured, for them is fatal. For a difficulty may be raised in a short one, which many long letters may fail to answer ; and damage to the Faith ensues. Whilst letters that are not upon matters of faith are published which are noteworthy oftentimes for want of charity, for weakness, and pointlessness, and even for vulgarity, which make one blush for the Movement which gives birth to, or encourages, or harbours, those who compose them.

You will clearly understand that I venture to criticise only the abuse of the Church Press. Its use, in moderation, is commendable to all who take an intelligent view of and interest in Church progress at home, or missionary work in the colonies ; who desire to learn the state of the Church abroad—little though we may glean how the sister Churches fare and what they do ; who wish to know the events which make for or against the Faith, as time goes on ; who like to see estimates of the new books which illustrate or support the Truth ; or who care to read the opinions of others on events which leave their mark on the history of the Catholic Revival. But, the abuse of newspaper reading, or its use in excess, I firmly believe, is a signal cause of injustice to oneself in the certain and calamitous result of one sort of Religious Dissipation.

SERMON
IV.

*The due
use of the
Church
press is of
value.*

The subject, however, is not at all exhausted by the Dissipation caused by Religious Societies and Newspapers. There are many other ways of falling into the same snare at which I will now only glance. Amongst them may be mentioned—public meetings on possible, imaginary, or actual dangers to the Church, and the un-Christian

*Religious
dissipation
results also
from other
causes :*

*1. public
meetings,*

SERMON
IV.

2. *theological controversies,*

3. *religious or parochial gossip,*

4. *ecclesiastical persecutions,*

5. *love of novelty.*

excitement which attends them ; theological controversies and the ill-will which they always engender ; religious gossip which often degenerates into scandal, or parish small-talk which, however undignified, must be called personal tittle-tattle, in a congregation, and the untold evil inevitable from such conversation ; ecclesiastical persecutions, and the animosity which they intensify ; incontinent seeking after novelty, for novelty's sake, in dogma or discipline, in ritual or music, in confession or direction—these are some amongst many ways in which we may dissipate away the grace of the holy Sacraments and do injury and injustice to our immortal souls.

The form religious dissipation takes in daily life.

1. *Indisposition for common duties.*

And what form, it may be asked, does this Dissipation take in our practical daily life, whereby we sin against the Virtue of Justice towards ourselves ? I answer—It takes as many forms as the Dissipation itself assumes. I will mention a few, by way of warning against more. In the first place, it indisposes us for the common-place, every-day duties of homely life, which after the unhealthy excitement produced by religious dissipation, appear at once tame and unprofitable. Hence, the dull, ordinary circle of the acts of bodily or spiritual charity, in

which we may be engaged, becomes irksome, and is often omitted. Next, it certainly produces a harmful effect upon our devotions. One of the great inward trials to which many—may I not say, most—persons are exposed, is distraction in prayer. But the distraction caused by means of the Dissipation I have named is inevitable. In the scenes in which we have been actors, the thoughts which crossed our mind, the words which we said or heard, the deeds which we did or witnessed, will not pass away with the occasion which gave them birth. They will be mentally considered; mentally enacted again; and once more mentally recalled for contemplation, with more or less of exaggeration, until the image, impressed upon our memories, will be self-apparent even in our holiest moments and devoutest times. Nor will the effect of this dissipation be confined either to our daily duties or times of prayer. Our whole inner life will become more or less tinged by the false colouring of the ideal scenes we have pictured to ourselves, or will become more or less tainted by the atmosphere in which we have lived, influenced by the actual scenes we have passed through. Self-sacrifices will be ignored. Purity of intention will become doubtful, if not impossible. Self-recollectedness will be hard to

SERMON
IV.

2. *Distraction in prayer.*

3. *Our inner life will become disorganised:*

sacrifices, intention, collectedness,

SERMON
IV.

*presence
and love of
God,
rule of life,
meditation,
examina-
tion,
reading,
and the
whole
spiritual
life.*

practise. The presence of God will be difficult to realise. The love of the Creator will wane before created interests. Moreover our rule of life will be relaxed, if not abandoned. Meditation will be found to be beyond our powers. Examination of conscience will be made a perfunctory duty. Devotional reading will be felt to be out of harmony with our actual life. And the whole tone and character of our supernatural existence will become sensibly lowered, until it eventually fades away under the noxious influences of a system which is supported only by its victims, which is mis-named religious, but which is truly and deservedly called Dissipation.

Summary.

We have thus considered the Cardinal Virtue of Justice, from a practical point of view, and in certain definite cases, under its three-fold division—Justice towards ourself, our neighbour, and our God. And we have made the consideration full to that extent, that only the shortest time may be further devoted before I conclude, to the theoretical part of our subject. But I am bound to set this also before you in outline: and I must beg you to bear for a few minutes with the dryness of such details.

Let us take four points, shortly, and in order :—

SERMON
IV.

*Four points
in the Vir-
tue.*

I. Justice may be defined to be a Moral Virtue whereby the will of man is so ordered as to make him constantly disposed to give to every one his due. *Actively* it enables him to acquit himself of what he owes, and *passively* it enables him to abstain from doing what he must omit—towards GOD, his neighbour, and himself. Some of the ways in which practically, we may either act, or abstain from acting, in this three-fold manner, have been set before you.

1. *Justice
defined in
two forms.*

II. The law of Justice to our neighbour enforces its exercise in a three-fold manner, to our *bettors*, our *equals*, and our *subordinates*. To those in dependence upon us, we owe consideration ; to our equals we owe self-devotion ; to our superiors we owe obedience—to all, brotherly love. By the exercise of this Virtue a natural act becomes marked with the third supernatural stamp of which I have spoken—the stamp of Justice ; and the third stage is reached by the agent towards perfection. The act which was first bold, and then prudent, now becomes just ; and a deed which was merely equitable may now

2. *Justice
exercised in
a threefold
manner.*

SERMON
IV.

be declared to be the result of the third Cardinal Virtue.

3. *Justice differently named under different circumstances.*

III. Justice may be considered as the foundation of peace and harmony amongst men. Under this aspect it acquires different names according to the different functions which it fulfils. For instance—Justice to our country is called *patriotism*; and to our parents, *piety*. Justice to our equals is called *courtesy*; to our inferiors, *affability*; to our superiors, *obedience*. Justice to ourselves is called *consistency*; and Justice to our God, *devotion*.

4. *Three elements of perfectibility in an act of Justice:*

IV. Lastly: There is one abstract proposition to be mentioned, which we omitted to work out when considering the Virtue of Fortitude. It concerns the last of the three elements which you will call to mind by the words, the motive, the law, and test, of an act of Cardinal Justice.

1. *the motive;*

1. The *motive* which influences, is the Glory of God.

2. *the law,*

2. The *law* which regulates, is the mean or middle term between excess and defect. The law will take cognisance of the three several forms of Justice which I have named; and the terms in each case are these:—

a. Towards God: a belief and practice founded on GOD's absolute and infinite Justice stands mid-way between a belief and practice based on GOD's Love apart from His Justice, and GOD's Wrath apart from man's free-will.

SERMON
IV.

*towards
God,*

b. Towards our neighbour: Justice is the mean between Indifference on the one hand, and Prejudice on the other.

*towards
our neigh-
bour,*

c. Towards ourselves: Justice is the happy medium, as we have seen, between religious selfishness, and religious dissipation.

*towards
ourselves ;*

3. The *test* which estimates, is the satisfaction which the act of Cardinal Justice affords to him who acts justly.

3. the test,

And it is to this test that I wish to direct your attention. It is, it can be no benefit to our moral condition before GOD, that we consent to act justly, or abstain from acting unjustly, towards ourselves, our neighbour, and our GOD, if the act of justice, in the doing and after it be done, cause pain to ourselves in the place of pleasure. It is evident that self-mastery in Justice cannot have been perfectly acquired, if we feel compunction, or regret, or actual sorrow, or a stronger sentiment, on account of having acted with Justice. In a sensitive and conscientious mind, the sorrow for having acted unjustly towards any given

*Satisfac-
tion in
acting with
Justice.*

*Penitence
for sin a
type of
satisfaction
for Justice.*

SERMON
IV.
—

person, ought to be both the law and gauge, ought to be the same in kind, and the same in degree, as the satisfaction realised after we have acted in accordance with the dictates of the Virtue of Justice, and *vice versa*.

*The feelings
should be
the same in
kind,*

It ought to be the same in kind—for it is evident that to perform an act of Justice, and then to be sorry we have done it, to bewail the effort which it cost us, to lament the results which flow from it, and to feel in our inmost mind that it had been better for us if we had done it not—such sentiments would tend to mar and not to make the perfection of any act of Moral Virtue. It also ought to be the same in degree—for to allow this, is to allow that latitude in all moral action, consequent on human imperfection, apart from which no merit for good works may be obtained. If, however, we admit that pleasure in the pursuit of Justice may follow the law of penitence for the commission of sin, it is all that we need. We shall, in such a case, first strive to feel satisfaction from the act from a sense of duty, if not from some lower motive. Then, we shall find pleasure in doing justly, for its own sake and for its results. And, lastly, we shall rise to the highest level in the moral scale, and love Justice, and find pleasure in showing Justice, and feel satisfaction

*and the
same in
degree.*

in having done Justice, simply and solely to the glory of God, and for the love of God.

SERMON
IV.

These points I leave you to work out for yourselves : and I conclude, by commending these thoughts on Justice towards God, our neighbour, and ourselves to your earnest consideration, and to the blessing of Almighty God.

A. M. D. G.

Sermon V.

TEMPERANCE.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues ; for she teacheth Temperance.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

SERMON
V.

*Temper-
ance.*

THE last special subject for our consideration on these Sunday mornings after Easter, we reach to-day. It is the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance, viewed in its relation to the ordinary life of a Catholic.

*The Virtue
defined—
moderation
in things
lawful:*

The Virtue of Temperance has been defined to be that supernatural quality which induces moderation in the lawful use of all GOD's gifts and creatures. And the force of this definition must be placed on the adjective *lawful* ; for there is no such thing, to a Christian, as moderation in the employment of things unlawful. Temperance, therefore, is a Virtue, by the power of which we obtain grace to neglect a lesser good, in order to gain a larger—both the thing we abstain

SERMON
V.*to what
extent,**with what
results**now and
hereafter.*

from, and the thing which we aspire after, being, emphatically, good. It is not only in eating, drinking, and sleeping, in business or pleasure, in work or relaxation, in things which must be done, or things which may be done, that this Virtue holds its sway. It claims supremacy over all man's appetites and passions, over all his desires and senses, over all his inclinations and wishes. Nothing is too large or too important in man's life to secure immunity from its influence. Nothing is too small or insignificant to escape exemption from the operation of its laws. By its use we acquire, it may be gradually and with pain, it may be after disappointment and relapse, but we acquire surely and certainly the immense advantage of detachment from things of sense. As the natural man is thus checked and thwarted, the supernatural man is vivified and quickened. And it is not too much to hope, that a life-long contention with excess in things lawful, will eventually give us an ascendancy over all the temptations of the world; and that the Virtue of Temperance—to use the language of the Litany—will find its exercise in all time of our tribulation, and in all time of our wealth, will find its fulfilment at the awful hour of

SERMON
V.
—

death, and its reward at the dreadful Day of Judgment.

*The course
of human
action re-
viewed from
another
aspect.*

Before we consider the office and functions of the Virtue of Temperance, and its effects upon certain phases of the every-day life of a Catholic, it may not be amiss to take a view of the whole subject of human action and how it may be perfected, from the stand-point of the Cardinal Virtues, different from the view which we have hitherto taken.

*Hitherto it
has been
viewed con-
structively,*

Up to the present time, we have been content to look at human action from the basis of Christian Virtue, in the course of construction. We have viewed the subject abstractedly ; and have considered, that any given agency is built up from one Virtue to another, until the whole supernatural edifice was as complete as the corporate and individual operation of the Cardinal Virtues could make it perfect. From our considerations on the last three Sundays we can now see that the elements of perfectibility, in a typical action, are nearly exhausted. Each act of Virtue must bear the stamp of four characteristics, of which we have considered three. Over and above the mere natural instincts of duty, an act of holiness must be infused with Christian Fortitude, with Christian Prudence,

*of which
we have
considered
three ele-
ments out
of four.*

SERMON
V.

and with Christian Justice. In other words, the deed must be done with superhuman boldness, superhuman wisdom, superhuman equity. Each of these qualities raised the typical action one degree above the level attained by a corresponding natural impulse. But there is one more stage to be gained, there is one more level to be mounted. And to this platform of perfection we will, with God's help, ascend to-day.

This final effect will be produced through the influence of the Virtue of Temperance. And the last stage in the upward advance will be attained by the impression upon the deed, which is just, and wise, and bold, of the stamp of moderation. The last Cardinal Virtue is needed in order to give the element of soberness to the act which has been dignified by Fortitude, has been performed judiciously by Prudence, has been made estimable by Justice—and to this element of soberness we give the name of Temperance. The brave, wise, just deed, to complete its goodness must be done with moderation. Such is the point in the supernatural building at which we have arrived this morning. And this point has been gained, I will repeat, by a process of construction.

*The last
element of
perfection
is Temper-
ance.*

SERMON
V.

*Human
action
viewed
under a
process of
disintegration,
e. g.:*

Let us now take the opposite course. Let us suppose that the task of disintegration, or of pulling down, in the stead of building up, is before us. Imagine that we are asked to estimate the value of an action that is wanting in one or more of those Cardinal Virtues which in their combination gave it perfection. The value of each individual Virtue, both alone and combined, in such a way will be more clearly seen ; and the gain in the sum total of perfection may be calculated, by the loss which ensues to the amount, by the process of subtraction.

*From an
action the
result of
the Four
Virtues,
eliminate*

We have seen, that an action, to be perfect, must possess four supernatural qualifications — Fortitude, Prudence, Justice, and Temperance. The action must be a sober, a just, a wise, a bold deed. Suppose then, by an exhaustive process, we eliminate, one by one, a single Virtue from the collective sum. Observe what will be the result. For instance :—Any given deed, to be perfect, must be done boldly, must be considered wisely, must be performed equitably, must be completed soberly. Suppose, in the first place, that the *last* quality be wanting, namely, Temperance. What will be the result? However brave, sagacious, and equitable a work may be, we cannot commend the deed,

1. *Temperance.*

if pushed indefinitely beyond the bounds of moderation. Suppose, again, that the *third* element be lacking, namely, Justice. Again, what will be the result? However brave, wise, and sober an act may appear to be, it cannot command our sympathies if it inflict injustice upon others, upon ourselves, or upon God. In the third place, whatever aspects of boldness, soberness, and justice a deed may offer, if it be performed foolishly, with no connexion between the means and end, men will laugh instead of praise. And this would result from the absence of the *second* Virtue, namely, Wisdom. Whilst, once more, if we imagine the *first* gift to be away, namely, Fortitude, however much temperance, equity, and wisdom may mark human action, if it be done timidly, and in a spirit of cowardice, men will despise the deed, men will neither honour nor follow the example.

SERMON
V.

2. *Justice.*

3. *Wisdom.*

4. *Forti-
tude.*

Such then are the results of this moral vivisection. We see, on the one hand, that the absence of any one of the Cardinal Virtues from a given act, to that extent causes it to fall short of perfection. We see, on the other hand, that the presence of each Virtue severally, or the presence of two or more in combination, to the same extent causes it to

*Summary
of results.*

SERMON
V.
—

tend towards, if it does not necessitate, supernatural perfectibility. When, therefore, timidity, infatuation, unfairness, and rashness are kept in check ; and when boldness, wisdom, justice, and sobriety are cultivated—whether or not we will it, the light of our actions will so shine before both men and Angels, that they will see our works, that they are good ; and the great end and only valid aim of all human agency on earth will be accomplished, for they, seeing our good works, will glorify our FATHER Which is in Heaven.

Temperance to be exercised in sensual desires and pleasures,

It seems almost needless, from this place, to affirm that the Virtue of Temperance, which we are about to consider, of necessity involves Moderation in the use of all the lower appetites and passions which we share in common with the beasts that perish. All such sensual desires and pleasures, however lawful and needful—and they are both needful and lawful—must be kept in check. They must be kept in check, not only before we can hope to exercise the Moderation which will tend to detachment from worldly things, but in order to secure our claim to the title of Christian, or members of the Crucified. For it were un-real, as has been well said, that we should be unmortified members of a thorn-

crowned Head. But it is not so needless to warn persons against the over-much use of those qualities and gifts of God which, more or less, man shares in common with the Angels which do Him service in Heaven. And it is more in regard to the use of Moderation in matters of refinement and cultivation, than of the abuse of the Virtue in gross and vulgar excess, that I desire to confer with you this morning. Yet, it may be advisable, even to the congregation which worships within these walls, to say a few words in passing upon individual actions and modes of life, which, though far from the sins which ought not to be, and on this occasion will not be, so much as named amongst us, if not regulated by Moderation, have a tendency to lead to such excesses. But, so far as it is proposed to speak at all, and in such a matter as this, it were a false delicacy to avoid plain speaking. And I will make no further apology by way of preface to a statement of the three cases which shall be named.

SERMON
V.

*as well as
in matters
of refine-
ment and
cultivation.*

1. There is not much danger, so it would appear, that any who hear me should fall into the animal and degrading vice of *gluttony*. Over-eating oneself is hardly a note of the present day—at least in the literal meaning

*Instances
of the
former:*

1. *Glut-
tony,*

SERMON
V.
—*and how
it is en-
couraged.*

of the words—even if we accept the traditional tendency of bodies corporate, upon which, from ignorance of this phase of society, I offer no opinion. But, putting aside all such extremes, if such there are, it may be fairly questioned whether or not some of us may not sin either in the temper or spirit of the deadly Vice we are considering. It may be questioned, in no unkindly or sarcastic way, but with earnest love for souls for whom CHRIST died; it may be questioned, I say, whether some of us may not be a little over-nice, a little too particular, perhaps even somewhat too fastidious and hyper-critical about their food—good, wholesome, power-producing food—on the score of its want of variety, or of its quality, or of the manner and way in which it is served. If this be so, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, here we find the germ; I do not say more, but here undoubtedly we find the germ of the gross and vulgar excess of gluttony, of which we decided not to speak; the germ, when not curbed by the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance.

*2. Drunk
enness,*

2. There is still less danger, so it would appear, that any I see before me should fall into the vice which is lower in the scale than even an animal propensity—the vice of over-

SERMON
V.

drinking. The sin of *drunkenness* is hardly less a note of the present day than the sin of *gluttony*. Though the amount of intoxicating liquors bought and sold may year by year become larger, yet drunkenness is gradually ceasing to be a national vice. It has actually ceased in one class of society. It has comparatively ceased in another. Yet, it may perhaps be an open question, whether some of us may not consume a proportion of stimulating, not to say of exciting liquids, which a medical man would declare to be more than sufficient to sustain a healthy vigour of body. Possibly, too, such a proportion may be consumed at a cost which we, or our families, can ill afford ; and with results, unperceived now, which, eventually and in the course of years, will weaken and impair, instead of energising and strengthening, the system. If this be so, again, here we find the seed of that lamentable excess, unchecked by Moderation, which will lead to those sins that we determined not to mention.

*and how
moderation
may be
used.*

3. There is no danger, I would fain hope, in any of us falling into the deadly sin of *sloth*. Yet, it is within the bounds of possibility that some of us, without being actual sluggards, may, in the day time, give way

3. *Sloth,*

*and how
excess must
be checked.*

SERMON
V.

over-much to a sense of bodily fatigue in the exercise of our duties ; or, at night or in the early morn, may deliberately, and as a habit to which custom has familiarised us, give ourselves up to a larger amount of sleep than any doctor would impose for the needful invigoration of the physical functions. And I feel myself the more at liberty to mention this form of sensual excess, because, though I am ignorant on the other points, I cannot be ignorant on this. Thank GOD this congregation forms a marked exception to many congregations which accept more or less fully Catholic Truth and Catholic Practice.

*Specially
in mid-day
reception.*

But, it is impossible to witness the needlessly large number of mid-day communicants at other Churches on Sundays or Festivals, or days of annual commemoration, or parish or diocesan gala days, without a fear—for I will not be uncharitable—without a painful, saddening fear, that many venture to communicate *un-fasting*, because they will not exercise Moderation in sleep and arise sometimes to receive their Divine LORD, in the only way the Church has ever ordered that her LORD should be received—fasting.

*Law of the
Universal
Church
upon the*

Upon this distressing subject to a Catholic mind, I will not say more, though I cannot say less, than this—That the Universal

Church, both East and West, from our LORD'S own fasting—observe, fasting—Celebration of the Last Supper to the present day, has known no other custom; that antiquity is decided, plain, and positive on this point; that the apparent exceptions of mid-day, or even of later Eucharists in early ages, on examination prove to have been made fasting; and that in modern times, and as regards our own Church, so far as I know, by act or deed, by rubric, homily, or canon, the Church of England has never departed from the faith and practice once delivered to the Saints, to the extent of presuming to sanction, authoritatively, the national sin of non-fasting Communion. Of course, the case of those in danger of death is beyond our present inquiry. But I have never heard a satisfactory answer to these two questions, with which I will dismiss the subject:—1. If the Priesthood fails to enjoin fasting Communion, what practice of equal importance can we enjoin, in virtue of the Vincentian law, of holding to all that at all times, in all places, and by all Christian men has been held in the Catholic Church? And 2. If this law holds good from the very first, by what authority do individual Priests take upon themselves to dispense their people

SERMON
V.

*question of
fasting
com-
munion.*

*to which
the Church
of England
assents.*

*Two ques-
tions to be
answered
before we
consent to
break the
law of
Christen-
dom:*

*1. What
can we en-
force if we
deny this?*

*2. By what
authority
do priests
dispense
their people*

SERMON
V.

*from this
law?*

*Are we
guilty of
want of
moderation?*

from the obligation to receive, fasting from earthly food, the LORD's own Body and His most precious Blood?

Thus might I call to mind, one by one, all the many ways in which it is possible to offend, as it were, in the lower strata of sensuality, against the Virtue of Temperance. And without attempting to judge those whom I know not, I might venture to ask, under each head of possible offence against undue eating, drinking, or sleeping—Are you, or are you not, Brother or Sister in CHRIST, guilty, not of excess, but of want of moderation? I must beg you, as in GOD's sight, to ask yourselves. I must bid you, as before GOD, to yourselves make answer.

*Four points
to be con-
sidered:
the virtue
to be exer-
cised in the
use of*

Let us now leave the confined atmosphere of these low-lands of sensuality, and ascend to a somewhat higher level in our moral investigation, in order to consider other points in our ordinary daily life, in which we may either employ or neglect the Virtue of Temperance. And I shall ask you to consider with me four points—our Reading, our Speaking, our Money, and our Time.

I. *Time.*

I. Let us, in the first place, discuss the question of *Time*, and its disposal at our hands.

SERMON
V.*Time divisible into two parts*

Now, the time which is at our disposal during the conscious moments of the day, is divisible into time which *must* be, and time which *may* be, employed upon ourselves. It is of the last of these divisions of time that I would speak. There is a wide field of inquiry open to us on the question of time that only may be utilised : and the moderate or im-moderate use of our leisure time is a fruitful source of violation of the Virtue which we are considering. For instance :— How much time is positively wasted, every day of our lives, by want of punctuality, or by want of order and method, either in ourselves or others? How much is squandered in the most un-satisfying of ways—in what way we are hardly able to tell, and for which we have little or nothing to show at the day's end? How much time, again, is dissipated away in the idle-mood which takes possession of some of us, in which we do nothing, or think of nothing, 'in particular' as we say? How much, once more, is lost in the lightest and least rational of amusements—where, mark you, my Brethren, honest relaxation of mind or body would do us good ; or in the still lighter and less intellectual forms of common-place conversation, which may begin in harmless gossip, and may end in harmful

Examples of time that we may spend on ourselves.

SERMON
V.
—

scandal. Such are a few of the ways in which we may fail to be moderate in the employment of the time, which, avowedly, is placed at our own disposal.

2. *Money.*

II. We may not less sin against the Virtue of Temperance in the use of our *Money*, than in the employment of our time.

*How is
money
spent that
may be
spent on
ourselves?*

Here, again, our money is divisible into two parts—money that we *must* spend, and money that we *may* spend, upon ourselves. Of course, of the former nothing is to be said. But of the latter, much may be urged, though I am not going to say much. I will only remind you, that, as a matter of fact, a large proportion of the money which may be spent upon themselves, and which persons put aside for their own disposal, is absolutely squandered in objectless vanities. We will not pause to ask whether those who thus squander give a tenth part of their substance, upon principle, to God's Church and God's poor, before and not after they scatter to the winds of inanity the competence with which God has blessed them. We will assume that God's debts are honestly and fully paid before the World is allowed to send in its account. And, even then, under the most favourable system of Christian almsgiving,

SERMON
V.

how often is the Virtue of Moderation forgotten, by ministering to our own self-indulgence, in the spending of money upon little, petty, insignificant matters, in which it is beneath the dignity of Christians to find satisfaction.

III. As we may offend against Moderation in the employment of our time and in the spending of our money, so may we sin against the Virtue of Temperance in the use of the *Words of our mouth.*

3. *Words of our mouth.*

• Perhaps the same law applies to the organs of speech, as we found to hold good in the case of time and of money. There are words which *must* be, and there are words which *may* be, spoken in our own behalf. Our concern, on the present occasion, is with the former. Moderation in speech is almost the Virtue of all Cardinal Virtues. It is the experience of many devout persons, that the subdual of that unruly member, the tongue, comes, in our moral course, the last in order of time, as it is the most hard, as a question of difficulty. Neither is the cause far to be sought. If moderation were habitually used in speech, sins of the tongue would not be so troublesome to cure, would not be so often and so hopelessly left uncontrolled.

How do we exercise speech in words that may be spoken?

SERMON

V.

And how may such moderation be employed? Out of many efficacious plans to this end, one golden rule may be given. It is this—Leave unsaid, from time to time, words that *may* be spoken, and you will acquire power inevitably, and always, over words that *must* be spoken.

*Two rules
for our
guidance:*

Do you ask, my Brethren, what sort of words are they which may be spoken, and yet, that it is true wisdom to leave unsaid? Let me endeavour to tell you, in two instances which come closely home to all of us.

*Leave
unspoken*

*1. words
which
mark our
individuality;*

1. Leave unspoken, from time to time, words which tend, or which may be made to tend, to mark your own individuality. Observe, I do not say words which tend to your own distinction, to your own importance, to your own honour. But all words are to be avoided which may make you, the speaker, and however undesignedly, the centre of your own, and it may be, your perfectly harmless story. Often—I do not say always, but often—leave unsaid such words as these. This is the first law of speech I would lay down to meet the circumstances of the case before us.

*2. words
which make
our neighbour the*

2. Nor is the second law far distant from the first. It is this. Still more often leave unspoken words which make your neighbour,

SERMON
V.*centre of
our story.*

or which tend to make your neighbour, the centre of your story—always excepting stories which make for, and not against, his own fair fame. Those which have a disposition to make our neighbour in any way remarkable—except for good—or notorious, or singular, or ridiculous, or un-amiable, such stories should be held on the tongue, lest they fall from the tongue, and in their fall should injure charity.

You will not, however, suppose that I would urge you never to speak of your neighbour, never to speak of yourself. Human society and intercourse could not continue under such an inhibition. I only desire earnestly to warn you to do *that* sometimes, which will always give you power over the gift of speech, *viz.*, to use moderation in words of themselves absolutely lawful.

*Limita-
tion of
these rules.*

IV. We have now considered Moderation in the use of time, of money, and of speech. Lastly, let us take one other subject, Moderation in the use of books and newspapers—Moderation in *Reading*. This is a subject which needs to be enforced in these days of cheap literature, and its wide circulation, because it seldom occurs to some persons, unless their attention is drawn to the question,

*4. Books
and news-
papers.*

SERMON
V.

that it is either advisable or necessary to exercise in such common-place matters the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance. Yet, is there not a cause to speak on such a question? I hope you will hold with me, my Brethren, before I conclude, that there is much cause.

*Secular
newspapers
—the con-
tents divi-
sible into
things
harmful
and harm-
less.*

I. In the first place, take the case of *Newspapers*. Take the case of any secular paper, such as any of us would read. How much does a copy of each daily or weekly issue contain, which, without being positively harmful, is read without edification, or is utterly unedifying for a Christian to read? How much do persons habitually read, without, in any way, being the better for the same—morally, religiously, intellectually, or even socially in regard to society? How much is mentally accepted without any corresponding effort to turn to a good account to one's own soul, by some metaphysical form of digestion, the facts or opinions which we allow ourselves mentally to entertain?

*1. Ex-
amples of
things
harmless
to read:*

*1 acci-
dents,
2 sudden
death,*

For instance:—Look at the reports in newspapers of accidents, adventures, or escapes—which seldom make those that read them duly thankful to a particular Providence for His special care, and their own individual safety. Look at the accounts of sudden death, against which we pray in the Litany;

SERMON
V.

or of those cases of summons to the bar of Divine Justice, which even newspaper writers and verdicts of coroners' inquests call, and rightly call, visitation of GOD—accounts which should never be read without a silent prayer for the soul of the hapless victim of GOD's visitation. Look, again, at the manner in which the daily lists of Births, Marriages, and Deaths are studied with a devotion and constancy by one sex, which is unintelligible to the other—lists which are so studied, of course, without harm, yet with no after-thought of the awful import which attaches to immortal souls from each one of these events in human life. Look, once more, at the isolated sentences, or sometimes the whole column, of 'things not generally known,' which almost invariably are not worth the knowing when they are known: or at the space occupied by petty personal gossip—gossip which is often absolutely pointless, or the only point of which lies in the object of the report, not in the report of the object.

³ *births, marriages, and deaths,*

⁴ *'things not generally known,'*

⁵ *personal gossip.*

All these things I assume to be harmless. But, how much does a copy of each paper contain which is not harmless, but which is utterly harmful, and of which a Christian should wish to be ignorant, instead of informed? Here I do not allude only, I do not allude

² *Things harmful to read,*

SERMON
V.

*over and
above the
reports of
the Divorce
Court.*

chiefly, to reports of the proceedings of the Divorce Court, which it is earnestly to be hoped that all who are chaste and pure, and who love to continue chaste and pure, avoid, as they would avoid poison. But I allude to the published details of any Court of Law, in which sin against any of GOD's commandments is the subject of investigation. It cannot be doubted, that, as the infusion into the mind of the other accounts of wickedness is actively defiling to the soul; so, the objectless study of these last cases tends to take off the keen edge of our Christian sensibilities with regard to sin.

Examples :

¹ *mur-
ders,*

For example :—Persons have been actually referred, by others living in Christianised society, to the columns of the public papers, for the account of a ‘nice’ murder, an act—observe, my Brethren—which has sent one fellow-man unconfessed, and perhaps impenitent, before the Judgment Seat of GOD, and which will cause the awful and violent death of another. Again — a suicide, specially if caused by jealousy, under ‘interesting’ circumstances, is a matter of much morbid excitement to another class of persons—who seldom pause to think of the fearful fate which follows the act of self-murder. Once more —the last and latest successful swindler,

² *suicides,*

³ *frauds,*

SERMON
V.

fraudulent bankrupt, defaulting trustee, dishonest tradesman, or idle adventurer who lives on his wits and other people's credulity, appear to captivate another class of minds. And such cases are studied with no clearer sense of deadly sin, than ensues from the conventional morality of business, and the inconveniences which arise, chiefly to the hero of the adventure, from the fact of his indiscretion in committing the unpardonable social offence—the sin of being 'found out.' And so might I pass along the pathway of crime, and show how each account is looked at, thought over, discussed, and even enjoyed, without one prayer for the conversion of the sinner; without one idea that GOD's grace alone keeps us from falling into even worse wickedness; and without one act of reparation to GOD's Divine Majesty, for His Dignity outraged, His Holiness insulted, His Long-suffering provoked, His Love set at nought and despised. And now, I ask you, with a certainty of your unspoken answer—Is there no moderation to be employed in the ordinary perusal of secular newspapers?

How these accounts are read.

Ought not moderation to be used in reading them?

To all that has been said only one qualification need be made. It is the temper of mind which we bring to bear upon these cases which, in general, decides their effect upon

One qualification: the temper of mind in which they

SERMON
V.

*are read
decides
their effect
on us.*

our souls. Harmful things may be made innocuous, and things harmless may be made edifying, or the opposite of these, according to the spirit with which we approach them. There can be no danger in a hard observance of vigilance in such matters. There may be danger in a lax observance. But even under the most unbending self-command, there will always be ample matter for intellectual gratification, educated criticism, and manly thought in the original leading articles, in the political intelligence, in the foreign news, in the literary estimates, and in the scientific and art notices of the ordinary high classed daily or weekly newspaper.

Books.

2. From moderation in the use of Newspapers, we will turn to moderation in the use of *Books*. And here, I had hoped to be able to speak of two different and opposite sorts of books, both of which may be, and often are, employed at the expense of the Virtue of Temperance—devotional works, and works of fiction. But time will allow us only to consider the last.

*In works
of fiction
moderation
only en-
joined ;*

And on *Works of Fiction* I would say less of the number of novels indulged in—though here also some of us might exercise moderation—than of the kind of novel which we permit ourselves to read. Neither is moderation an extreme term to apply to the duty of

SERMON
V.

using discernment in the choice of novel reading. Perhaps a more emphatic term ought to have been employed—for there is an amount of poison, moral and religious alike, contained in our lighter forms of literature, enough to contaminate the minds of a whole generation. Observe, my Brethren, that as Moderation only is urged upon you, in the use of fiction, this form of relaxation is held to be healthful, sound, and good. Such is the case. Works of fiction in the abstract are not only harmless, but rationally edifying: but then, the books themselves must be unobjectionable both in tone and in morals.

*not avoid-
ance ; for
the use of
good fiction
is edifying.*

Now, I do not hesitate to affirm, that many of our popular works of imagination are highly objectionable, not only in faith and morals, but also in tone and style. That the style may be vulgar and the tone offensive, at the worst, only spoils the intellectual pleasure of an educated and refined person. But, that there should be aught to object to in faith or morals is more important, and should be made a bar to the use of all such novels. Alas, my Brethren, that the exact opposite should be almost the law of English society at the present time. Provided only that the work is written by a known writer, or is sufficiently

*Much mo-
dern fiction
is immoral
and
vulgar.*

*Its vul-
garity is
of little
moment,
but its im-
morality
is ali-im-
portant.*

SERMON
V.

*The reverse
widely
held.*

*How the
tale of sin
is told;*

*with what
result to
the reader;*

*and how
discussed
in society.*

talented, or is exciting enough apart from authorship, the question of morals, either in the author or the work, is left unexamined or is passed by unheeded. The injury, however, that is done by the indiscriminate use of immoral fiction is untold. The tale of sin is so cleverly conceived; the details of wickedness are so artistically worked out; the interest in vice is so keenly and constantly kept at the highest point; and ungodliness and wrong are depicted in such inoffensive terms, that—even though, in the main, Virtue may be rewarded, whilst evil is unsuccessful, if not punished, yet—the reader is led onwards from end to end of the fiction, with unflagged attention, with a sense of reality caused by the action of the imagination on the memory, and with moral judgment either hopelessly led captive, or dangerously confused. It is much to be desired, and often it mercifully happens, that many who are devourers of novels such as these do not stop to digest, or, as a fact, are incapable of digesting, their intellectual nourishment. Otherwise we should not so often hear discussed in society—yes, and even by ladies—with calmness and self-possession, novels, of which the plot is laid in sin, the tale is worked out in sin, the end is consummated in sin, and the whole

SERMON
V.

interest of the fiction is instinct with sin—and that sin, is sin against the seventh Commandment. Whilst, to add to the moral degradation of the whole matter, many, and some of the worst specimens of this class of immoral novels, are avowedly the composition of English women.

That this is no exaggerated picture, I may safely appeal to you, my Brothers in the LORD, to decide. For myself, I am a disbeliever in a mere literary estimate, or artistic view, of these works of fiction. The mass of those who read them—specially the young of either sex—not only do not study, but are intellectually powerless to study them with a critical intention. For the most part, amusement is the highest object in view, or distraction from cares, or relief from pain, or a comparatively harmless mode of ‘killing’ time. And for the passing pleasures of relaxation after honest work, I earnestly warn those who will be warned, against this ensnaring temptation. The idea is fallacious, that no harm can ensue, when the details of disguised sin, veiled wickedness, captivating vice, and muscular wantonness pass through the mind, on this ground, because they may be, or rather, because they are, though they ought not to be, discussed by men before ladies in

*Mere
critical
estimates
of bad
morals
unreal.*

*A warning
against
their use
under a
false plea.*

SERMON
V.

*Avoidance
of bad
fiction one
way of
exercising
moderation.*

conventionally decent language. Such efforts of the imagination cannot be entertained by any, however pure, without danger of defilement: and the only safe plan, both for ourselves and for those over whom we exercise authority, is ourselves to avoid, and to make them avoid, such novels, as one would shun pestilence. In this way may we cultivate the Virtue of Temperance in the employment of works of fiction.

*Summary.
Examples
taken from
small
matters.*

I have thus endeavoured to place before you examples, in the common-place duties of every-day life, of the way in which we may cultivate one phase of the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance, in small matters. Moderation in the use of books, of papers, of speech, of money, and of time, which has become habitual, will enable us to employ moderation in larger matters, in things of more consequence, and in other ways. Life, to most persons, is made up of small things, which are done without effort, and are done over and over again. It is more needful, then, to supply an incentive for the fulfilment of these, than to speak of questions of importance, which seldom occur to any of us, which do not happen at all to most persons, and which generally evolve for themselves, a satisfactory

*Things of
importance
not con-
sidered.
They are
best done by
those who*

solution in the moment of action. I shall, therefore, leave untouched these last elements of life, with the assurance, that the best training for the due performance of large matters occasionally, is always to do small things well. In no case is this law more true than in the case of the Virtue of Temperance. For, Moderation exercised in small things will inevitably secure detachment from things of sense : and detachment from things of sense will ensure, in matters of import, that self-mastery which will enable us to do them well.

SERMON
V.

*do small
things
well.*

In conclusion, I have to tax your patience, once more and for the last time, my Brethren, to consider one abstract proposition connected with the Virtue of Temperance.

*Conclu-
sion.*

The Cardinal Virtue of Temperance, let me call to mind, is that supernatural quality which induces moderation in the lawful use of all GOD's gifts and creatures. It is a Virtue, says an old writer, "which ruleth the appetite, and bridleth our sensual delights, and maketh a man content to moderate himself in them, according to the principle" laid down at the outset, the neglect of a lesser good in order to obtain a larger, both the thing that we abstain from, and the thing that we aspire after being emphatically good.

*Tempe-
rance de-
fined.*

SERMON
V.

*The Virtue
is divisible
into,*

*Tempe-
rance,
Soberness,
Frugality,
Conti-
nence, Mo-
desty, For-
bearance,
Self-con-
quest, Self-
denial, Mo-
deration.*

*One
abstract
proposi-
tion.*

*Four con-
ditions of
a perfect
moral
action.*

“And it is divided,” continues the author, “into divers sorts and kinds, according to several matters in which the Virtue is employed.” For, in the language of the Catechism, and in relation to food, the Virtue is called *Temperance*; in relation to drink, *Soberness*; in relation to both, *Frugality* or *Abstemiousness*. Again, in connection with the sexes it is called *Continence* or *Chastity*. And again, in action it is called *Modesty*; in anger, *Forbearance*; in desire, *Self-conquest*; in pleasure, *Self-denial*; and in all, *Moderation*.

Over and above the elements of perfectibility which have been discussed with reference to the other Cardinal Virtues, on the earlier Sundays after Easter, this one abstract proposition has to be considered to-day. There are certain conditions to be fulfilled, before we can affirm of any action that it has left the natural state for the supernatural; before we may declare, in a Christian sense, that it deserves the term, virtuous. The conditions to be fulfilled are four in number: and as applied to the Virtue of Temperance, the following points which I shall mention analytically well deserved to be worked out in detail:—

SERMON
V.

*It must be
done
1. with
full know-
ledge,*

Firstly. The Virtue of Temperance must have been exercised *with full knowledge* of the deed. It is at once clear, that Moderation, in any form, exercised in ignorance; or in any act, without intentionally using the Virtue; or the fact of employing Moderation only by the dictates of natural taste, inclination, or desire—it is clear that such self-command, in any physical or intellectual form, is not Christian Moderation. It is not an act of the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance. Full knowledge, therefore, is the first condition of perfection. And the only qualification here to be made is the case in which supernatural Temperance, by long continued habit, appears almost instinctively to be the result of natural moderation.

*2. by free
moral
choice,*

Secondly. With full knowledge of the deed, the act must have been performed *by free moral choice*. As the knowledge of the middle term in Temperance, is intellectual excellence; so, the choice of such mean is the moral excellence, in any given act of Virtue. The term choice implies opposite extremes. There must have been a possibility not to act, as well as a permission to act: there must have been allowed an option—a choice to do, and a choice not to do, before natural instinct could attain the dignity of supernatural

SERMON
V.

Grace. This option is implied in a free moral choice.

3. *disinterestedly,*

Thirdly. After free moral choice, and upon full knowledge, the act of Temperance must have been done *disinterestedly*. Selfishness alone is enough to spoil any supernatural action, and to deprive us of all supernatural merit in our good works. And apart from the love of self only may any developement of human tendencies claim to form a portion of Christian Moderation.

4. *upon principle.*

Lastly. With no thought of self, after free choice, and upon full knowledge, the act must have been the out-come of *principle*, not the issue of chance. Haphazard or casual actions, or good works done by fits and starts, are very far distant from deliberate, careful, well-advised acts of Virtue.

*Summary
of the
conditions,*

Such are the four conditions which tend to the perfectibility of any given act of the Virtue of Temperance.

1. The act must be the result of principle :
2. The act must have been done disinterestedly :
3. The act must have been performed after free moral choice :
4. The act must be exercised with full knowledge.

SERMON
V.*and their
applica-
tion.*

To refer once more to the cases we have considered, these conditions will have their effect not only upon the lower gratifications of our animal nature, as in the case of eating, drinking, and sleeping ; but also upon the more intellectual portion of our being, and will influence the disposal of our time and our money ; our power over speech ; our method of reading the newspapers we glance at ; our selection of the novels with which we amuse ourselves. Disconnected from these four conditions, the act does not escape from its natural estate. Influenced by these four conditions, the act gains the level of a supernatural existence.

A. M. D. G.

Sermon VI.

CONCLUSION.

If a man love Righteousness, her labours are Virtues ; for she teacheth Temperance and Prudence, Justice and Fortitude.

WISDOM, viii. 7.

SERMON
VI.

*The life of
a Christian
under two
aspects,
public and
private, is
really one;*

THE life of a Christian may be viewed under two aspects. Either it may be looked upon as the conduct of a public man in a private capacity ; or it may be watched as the course of a private person in public life. The public servant may be contemplated in the family circle. The private subject may be considered in the world at large. But the public career and the private life of a citizen of the world, who is a member of the Church, are only two phases of one composite state of existence. The forms of such a state of existence may be variously organised ; and its functions may be endlessly diverse. But the guiding law which governs the one will be self-apparently the same ; and the active results which flow from the other will be

*and in our
case may be*

SERMON

VI

harmoniously consistent. The life, however, in either case is but one. It is not manifold.

And so far as the national and domestic life of him who speaks our mother tongue are concerned, the difference in the aspect of the two phases of existence may be described by the terms, an English Catholic, and a Catholic Englishman.

*described
as that of
an English
Catholic
and a
Catholic
English-
man.*

The truths here enunciated, namely—That the life of a Christian may be viewed under two aspects ; and yet—That, before GOD, the public career and the private life of a Catholic are essentially one, these truths cover an important principle in all questions of morals. Of their positive certainty there can be no doubt. Their reality may be perceived from this fact—That the code of ethics given by GOD to man, either as the law for a single Nation, or as a principle to govern the conduct of an Universe, was—observe—one, not diverse. The Divine Lawgiver was not pleased to legislate apart and severally for the public citizen and the private subject. As the unity of man is assumed in Holy Scripture ; so is the unity of the law declared, by which man is to be judged. One uniform standard is set up for all men under both dispensations. One general formula, either

*These
truths un-
doubtedly
important
examined.*

SERMON
VI.

conditional or unconditioned, is announced for all. And the positive commands of the CHRIST in the New Testament at once are symbolised by, and fulfil the negative commandments of, the Eternal WORD in the Old—both being absolutely and universally comprehensive.

Society holds to a manifold organism and responsibility in man.

Modern civilisation declines to accept this fact ; and, as if upon principle, delights in the results which issue from its denial. Society seems to hold that man is, or may be assumed to be, the accidental combination of two or more individual agencies. These individual agencies are at once blended with and distinct from, both one another, and the body corporate which absorbs them all. They possess their own liberties and privileges, apart from the privileges and liberties of the other elements. They have rights with which no other can interfere. They have duties which no other can perform. But, by a confusion of ideas—which they only who act upon the theory may explain—the responsibility that is the result of privilege, and the accountability consequent on duty, which attach to the several individual members, are not shared, or are not fully shared, by the body politic whose component elements they form.

The simplest outline which this ethical paradox can assume in modern Society is this :—To consider any given person to be the collective whole of two independent factors—to be at once, jointly and independently, both a private individual and a public character. And the question to which the truths above mentioned afford a practical answer may be thus stated :—Whether or not the composite being which absorbs these two factors, is responsible for all actions done by him through either agency, which together constitute his corporate individuality? Christianity and common sense assert that he is personally accountable. The World and Society at large, without pledging themselves to a formal denial of this proposition, in act and deed affirm the opposite theory. They assert, either, that the public character of a man is not to influence the private estimation in which he may be held ; or, that his private character is not to be weighed, when the public worth of the man is under consideration.

SERMON
VI.

*Example
of a two-
fold in-
stance, in
public and
private life,*

This is one form which the social sophism is made to assume. But there is a further quibble in popular casuistry to be demolished. For there is a wide-spread tendency to believe that either of the two independent

*in which
respon-
sibility is
divided and
hence
evaded.*

SERMON
VI.

*The truth
asserted.*

factors may be imperfect, and yet, that the composite being may be commenable. In other words, this belief is widely entertained, that, before God, one and the same person, may be, at one and the same time, a bad man and a good Christian. I will not, however, twice kill this absurd and wicked abstraction ; for to enunciate it, is to ensure its condemnation at your hands, my Brethren. But, I shall assume your assent to the proposition, that, individually and collectively, the actions of our public and private life are at once to be guided and judged, both before God and man, by the effect upon our personal character of the four sources of supernatural power, the Cardinal Virtues of Fortitude, Prudence, Justice, and Temperance.

*Intention
of these
Sermons
two-fold,*

- These Sermons, on the Sunday mornings next after Easter, are intended to fulfil the double office of discussing the Cardinal Virtues in relation both to the public and the private life of Catholics. On the four last
1. Sundays, I have endeavoured—1. To obtain as distinct a view as it is possible to secure of
 2. each Virtue in succession ; and 2. To set before you certain phases of ordinary common-place existence, in which the several Virtues might be exercised in private life

This endeavour has necessitated the attempt to discuss features of every-day life, which are more or less common to all Catholics. And the discussion of these positions has been followed at once, in each case, by an effort to meet these difficulties, by the aid respectively of the Four Cardinal Virtues. Such a course was not only feasible, in the case of the private life of those to whom I speak, but, it appeared to me to be the only practical course to adopt. The private life of Catholics is not subject to invariable law. It is made up of small, insignificant, daily duties, which may not be considered generally, but must be considered in detail. Hence, typical portions of ordinary life have been depicted, and their difficulties have been stated. Hence, too, corresponding solutions have been offered for your acceptance, as GOD gave me power specially to suggest them.

The case of the public life of Catholics is different, and must be treated differently. The public life of a Catholic, however anomalous, is normal. As regards his membership in the Church, so long as she remains in corporate union with the State—or more exactly, so long as the State holds to its theoretic union with the Church—so long is his position defined, regulated, and protected by law.

SERMON
VI.

*Private
life of
Catholics is
variable.*

*Their
public life
is normal.*

SERMON
VI.

The treatment of the two cases must be different.

That such law, in administration, may be lawless and bad, touches not the point. That such law, legislatively, may be changeable and changeful, alters not the question. The fact of such a position being legally entertained, and legally supported, necessitates a treatment of the public life of a Catholic—from the stand-point of the Cardinal Virtues—different from the manner in which his private life was considered. In the case of public life, it is impossible to analyse the career of a Catholic Englishman—to employ the distinction made at the outset—with the minuteness bestowed upon the ordinary daily life of an English Catholic. A broader, wider view of existence may be taken from the centre of national politics, than from even the circumference of domestic life. A more comprehensive system, therefore, must be adopted. It was needful to obtain, at a single glance, an estimate of the position which a Catholic, as a member of the Commonwealth, holds in the country, before we could attempt to consider the action of the Cardinal Virtues upon his public life. This effort was made upon Low Sunday. It only remains that we should now strive to make definite the general conclusion at which we then arrived ; that we should attempt to perceive how action may be taken,

SERMON
VI.

now that we understand exactly the position in which we find ourselves placed. This, my Brethren, with God's help, we will endeavour to do this morning.

Before we attempt to consider the influence of the Cardinal Virtues upon the public lives of Catholic Englishmen, there is one point to be mentioned, upon which no doubt must be left upon our minds. No doubt, I say ; for any doubt upon the point would invalidate future arguments, and the ordinary English mind feels a difficulty to escape from doubt upon the point. The proposition, however, assumes a definite shape and may be stated concisely in an affirmative form :—We, Englishmen, are a self-governed people. A simple statement, you will say, upon which no doubt ought to exist on the minds of any. A simple statement, I answer, which is widely denied ; but the importance of which is only equalled by its simplicity. It is widely denied : though in principle, its truth extends, perhaps, universally ; though in practice, its reality certainly includes ourselves. It is important : for the principle of self-government contains at once both the authority and the justification for the course we are about to pursue. The proposition contains the

Preliminary point :

That we are self-governed includes at once

SERMON
VI.

the authority and the justification for our course of action.

authority. For, if we were otherwise than self-governed, we should not possess the power, which we legally possess, to effect the changes that are contemplated. The proposition contains, also, the justification. For, were we not self-governed, we should not enjoy the *right*, which we constitutionally enjoy, to alter that which is in course of alteration. Neither is this statement the outcome of that foolish jumble of words which they invent who are intent—on the score of party politics—to sow discord in the midst of those that hold the Catholic Faith, and which they call ‘High-Church Radicalism.’ That we are self-governed, if it express other than matter of fact, is neither more nor less than the developement of Conservative principles, as held by Constitutional authorities.

Self-government the basis of union between Church and State.

England, therefore, is a self-governed nation. And, however much some persons may dislike the idea, or malign those who accept it, the principle of self-government is the one and only principle upon which the present corporate union of Church and State actually exists. That such is the case, may be denied on a single hypothesis—That the union of the National Life with the Body of CHRIST, is of Divine authority, originated by Divine command, and continued by Divine will.

Divine Authority the only other alternative.

SERMON
VI.

For this hypothesis, we may be excused if we demand further proof than mere assertion. That so Divine a polity has once existed upon Earth, admits of no doubt. For its existence we can point to the authority of Inspiration. That such a polity has existed more than once, admits of grave doubt. Certainly Holy Scripture cannot be quoted in support of such a theory. Can, then, equal authority, can any authority, comparable to that on behalf of the Jewish Theocracy, or the Jewish Monarchy, be claimed for the present union which exists between the English Nation and the English Church? I need not affirm, emphatically, that there is none.

If this be so; if there be no Divine Authority for the union of CHRIST'S Church with the Secular Power in England; if the authority for the Church and State theory ultimately evolves itself out of, as it must ultimately be evolved from, this truism—that we are a self-governed people—mark, I pray you, my Brethren, what ensues from this admission. That which a self-governed nation can do, a self-governed nation can undo. If we have sanctioned the union, we may enforce the dissolution of the union. The power which unites has authority to divorce. And the position here asserted in principle,

*Failing all
proof of
this, what
results?*

*That
which has
been done
may be
undone.*

SERMON
VI.

has been acted upon in practice from the first. The terms of union between Church and State have never been, at any time, unchangeable. The union at the present day, in its terms at least, is a different union to that which existed at different eras of our national life—let us say before the admission of Jews into Parliament, before the passing of the First Reform Bill, before the Catholic Emancipation, before the Test and Corporation Act, before the Revolution, before the Great Rebellion.

*Changes in
the terms
of union
effected both
of right
and by
power.*

Now, the right to adopt the changes in the union of Church and State, of which these eras are suggestive, has been conceded in default of all proof for Divine authority for that which is changed ; has been conceded in favour of the fact that we are a self-governed people. The power to effect them none can deny. Nor will it suffice to affirm that, in the ages when Church and State became corporately one, we were otherwise than self-governed ; because kingly power, which—mark you—is not of Divine right, must eventually accept its authority from the national will. If, therefore, it be within the power of a self-governed people constitutionally to effect changes in the union which are, in truth, fundamental ; it is also within the

*If change
be allowed
dissolution
is lawful.*

SERMON
VI.

power of a self-governed people constitutionally to dissolve an union the essential principles of which, one by one, have been deliberately abandoned. This is the point, my Brethren, to which I desired to lead you ; upon which I desired to leave no doubt upon your minds. For the corporate union which self-government at first willed to exist under certain conditions, and at a later date willed to exist under changed conditions, may at the present, or at some future time, will to exist under no conditions whatever. In other words, self-government possesses both the right and the power, actually and constitutionally, before GOD and man, to dissolve the existing union between the Established Religion and the Temporal Authority of this country.

It is, perhaps, too much to expect, after an interval of a month, that you, my Brethren, can call to mind the details in the present phase of the union of Church and State which I laid before you in the first Sermon of this course. But I venture to think that you may still retain a general impression of the results at which we arrived on this question. We saw, that, from a religious point of view, the connection was almost as

*Review of
the present
conditions
of the
union.*

SERMON
VI.

bad, almost as immoral, almost as anti-Christian, as it possibly could be. We saw that the State had not only not kept faith with the Church negatively ; but, positively, had done more than enough morally to dissolve the union, whilst declining legally to effect the separation. We saw, in many points in which the religious side of the Secular Power came into contact with the secular side of the Religious Power, that damage to God's truth, if not to man's faith, ensued. We saw, again, that nearly each spiritual phase of man's natural life in some aspect had been tampered with by the temporality. We saw that many phases of the corporate life of the Church in its government, in its discipline, in its inheritance, in its power of educating, and even in its right to its own form of worship, had been seriously interfered with, and invaded by the State. We saw, lastly, that whilst the tendency of all modern legislation was to relax the bondage, to lighten the burden, and to remove the disabilities of every other form of religionism, true or false, within our borders, the Church of CHRIST alone, was still held fast in the iron fetters of a system, of which nearly each feature has been changed, save the one which would afford liberty to the enslaved. Such were some of the aspects we

observed in the union of the Establishment and the Nation, or rather of a supremacy which involved the subjection of the Church, at the will and pleasure of a self-governed people. And it is in relation to these facts that the Four Cardinal Virtues are called on to exercise their functions in the public life of a Catholic.

SERMON
VI.

If it be true, as we agreed that it was true, that, to the same extent to which the Church, I will not say silently acquiesces in this condition of affairs, but fails actively to protest against the present ungodly alliance between Church and State, to the like extent is she responsible before GOD and man, for its continuance—if this be true, we shall easily perceive in what way the Four Cardinal Virtues may hope to co-operate with each member of the Church, in striving to obtain a dissolution of the union. And the way in which I shall endeavour to set before you how the Cardinal Virtues may influence the great work of Disestablishment, is to take each Virtue in succession, and discuss the bearings of one of its characteristics on the question before us. But their general effect may in the first place be concisely stated thus—the Virtue of Fortitude may be exercised upon ourselves, before Disestablishment is secured : the Virtue

How the Church is responsible;

and how the Cardinal Virtues may be exercised :

*Fortitude towards ourselves ;
Prudence*

SERMON
VI.

*towards
the State;
Justice
towards
others;
Tempe-
rance
towards the
Church.*

of Prudence may be exercised in our efforts upon the State, in order to obtain Disestablishment: the Virtue of Justice may be exercised towards others, until Disestablishment be realised: and the Virtue of Temperance may be exercised towards the Church after Disestablishment, by God's blessing, has been gained. We will, therefore, take these four points in order. And we will shortly consider, in each case, how, and in what way, and to what extent a single phase of each Virtue may be made to bear upon the public life of a Catholic, and be employed to guide

1. our action, 1, in patient waiting, 2, during
3. active agitation, 3, under unjust legislation,
4. and 4, after successful victory in the coming struggle for the freedom of the Church.

*How For-
titude may
be exercised
towards
ourselves:*

I. In the first place we will consider how the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude may be exercised upon ourselves before Disestablishment is secured.

*under the
form of
Patience.*

In the position in which we find ourselves placed with regard to the coming dissolution of the union between the nation and the Church, we are called upon to make use of that phase of passive Fortitude, which is termed Patience. Disestablishment may come upon us at once; we may have to wait

SERMON
VI.

years for our deliverance. The life of a nation is not as the life of any unit of the nation. And though England, as a nation, may be, and I firmly believe is, on the verge of this mighty change ; yet, the change may not come within the life-time of any given member, we will say, of this congregation. On the other hand, Disestablishment may come, absolutely (as well as by comparison with organic revolutions) quickly, being hastened by the prayers of the faithful ; for this is a rapid age ; and the power of prayer is large. But whether the dissolution comes slowly, or swiftly comes, in the meantime, Patience must be used, if we would cultivate the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude in our public life. And the Virtue perhaps, will be the more easily exercised, if we give due weight to the following considerations.

You will not, I hope, consider that I wish to minimise the evils of which the Church has cause to complain at the hands of the State. But you must be reminded of the wide, deep, and real difference which exists between the Church in her spiritual capacity and the Church as to her temporal accidents ; in other words, between the Church and the Establishment. The difference is wide and deep, between these two aspects ; though in

*Difference
between the
Church
and the
Establish-
ment :*

SERMON
VI.

*and the
greater
part of her
ills come to
her on the
latter side.*

certain matters the interval becomes at once narrowed and more shallow. It is most real; though in some phases of both, their shadows fade away into a common tint. And it is a matter of fact that much, though by no means all, of which the Church complains, at the hands of the State, she complains of, either in the interest of the Establishment, or upon subjects situate on the common shadows between the Establishment and herself. Observe, I do not say that the Church, as the Church, suffers not at all; but the more part of her wrongs are inflicted from the temporal side of her existence, than from the spiritual; are inflicted from that neutral ground which may be claimed by neither exclusively, but which covers many elements common to both.

*Were it
otherwise
Patience
would not
be the
Virtue to
be culti-
vated.*

From the nature of the case, from the spiritual organism of the Church, and from the comparatively few points in which the natural and supernatural can meet, this aspect of the Church's ills is almost essential. Were it otherwise, were it possible that the State had the power as it has the will, and that the State employed the power as it has the wish, to injure the spiritual side of the Body of CHRIST, the Cardinal Virtue to be exercised would not be the passive phase of the

SERMON
VI.

Virtue of Fortitude. A different and more active form of Fortitude than Patience would be called, would be emphatically called into play. Is this then, it may be asked, an argument for the exercise of that spurious form of Fortitude, which begets indifference? I answer—Not at all. Is it an argument for leaving unchecked the State to work its godless will upon the Church? Far otherwise. Putting aside, for the moment, the fact that the essentials of the Church are attacked, the accidental features of the Established religion form the outposts of the Catholic Church's citadel; and to lose the first is to endanger the last. But over and above this aspect of the truth, we defend the temporal side of the essentials, because they form a portion of our inherited rights, which may not be abandoned; because they are terms in a contract, which ought not to be violated. It is true indeed that the Dissolution of the union of Church and State would ensure to us new privileges, which would atone for old rights denied; would dispense us from a bargain of which the contract was binding only on ourselves. But, until such a time shall come, the Cardinal Virtue of Fortitude may be exercised by ourselves, under the form of Patience, in bearing with the tyranny of the State against

*Why we
defend the
accidents
of the
Church.*

SERMON
VI.

the Church in non-essentials. And in such a way may the Virtue be made to bear on the public life of a Catholic.

*How
Prudence
may be
exercised
towards
the State:
under the
form of
Perseve-
rance.*

II. We must also exercise the Cardinal Virtue of Prudence in our efforts on the State to obtain the boon of Disestablishment for the Church. And the form in which this Virtue may be called upon to play its part on the public life of a Catholic, is in one phase of Perseverance.

*Public
measures
become law
through
agitation.*

On this point, it is well to take a friendly leaf out of an adversary's book. If we are at the pains to consider the way in which public measures eventually become law in England, which, at the first, are unpopular, or about which the nation is indifferent, or upon which opinion is divided, we shall see that a certain order seems to follow their course, from active opposition, through dull indifference, up to hearty acceptance. And the whole process is either contained, or implied in that phase of the Virtue of Perseverance which, under such circumstances of public life, is called 'Agitation.' If persons, sometimes even single persons, more often bodies of persons, united in one common object, nerved with one common will, acting with the same means, and tending to the

SERMON
VI.

same end—if persons, I say, will only take the trouble to agitate long enough, to agitate widely enough, to agitate with sufficient discretion, to agitate with sufficient perseverance, almost any public measure may eventually be carried in this self-governed country. No doubt such measures as have social worth, moral goodness, political right, or political expediency to urge on their behalf, will succeed by agitation more quickly and more certainly than measures which lack these elements of acceptability. Witness the course of the first Reform Bill, which, rejected over and over again, at last became the law of the land—the efficient cause of acceptance being persevering agitation. But measures that are absolutely vicious in their character also become law eventually, either directly from the sheer force of perseverance, on the part of their supporters, or indirectly from languid opposition or actual carelessness, on the part of their opponents. Witness the course of that detestable bill, originated, so it is said, by a little knot of wealthy men, which is almost certain shortly to become statute law, and which only lately escaped success by a small majority—I mean the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—the only one redeeming point about which I conceive to be this, that it will

*Examples:
in the past;*

*in the
possible
future.*

SERMON
VI.

*Some
means of
agitating
for Dis-
establish-
ment.*

firmly drive home one more nail into the dishonoured coffin of the Church Establishment.

Thus, we must agitate. But how must agitation be employed? Again I point to the tactics of our enemies. The first point is to secure people's interest in the change, or to wean their attachment from that which is to be changed. And, to this end, the public mind must be 'educated' up to the point of change. The measure must, in private life, be talked over and written about. In public life, societies must be formed, committees must be appointed, meetings must be held, speeches must be spoken, papers must be read. That great engine, the press, must be made to work—by leading articles, by essays, by letters, by reports, by paragraphs—and all the smaller miscellaneous machinery, which popular agitators so well know how to use, must be employed. Then, the question must be laid before Parliament; and the promoters must expect it to pass through many phases before it is finally accepted of the nation. The scheme must first bear the ordeal of being satirised by the daily infallible exponent of public opinion; next of being criticised from absurdly false premises, and discussed with an ignorance which assumes knowledge, and always betrays the assumption; and at last—

SERMON
VI.

and this, to a sensitive, educated mind, is the severest ordeal of all, though success is now at hand—of being patronised by the organ which formerly condemned, and of being supported by a power too weak to offer further opposition, but sufficiently servile to follow the winning side. Public opinion now wavers; and agitation meets with its reward.

Such is the sort of agitation, which may be exercised in a Christian spirit, which is one form of Perseverance, which is the result of the Cardinal Virtue of Prudence cultivated in the public life of Catholics, and brought to bear upon a single point of the deepest importance, the freedom of the Church from national bondage—such is the sort of agitation which may be employed by the Catholic Party to obtain the blessing of Disestablishment.

*but to be
employed,
in a
Christian
temper.*

III. We must, however, not only exercise Fortitude upon ourselves, and Prudence in our dealings with the State; but we must also exercise Justice towards others, until Disestablishment be effected.

*How
Justice
may be
exercised
towards
others.*

The Cardinal Virtue of Justice must be exercised towards others to this extent:—As an integral portion, and even though a small, yet an important portion of the State, and, so

*Strict
Justice
must be
used.*

SERMON
VI.

*An
example
from
history.*

far as our influence extends, we must not hesitate to afford Justice to others, notwithstanding that Justice is not meted in like measure to ourselves. We must be just, so long as we part not with our principles, so long as we are not liberal with that which is not ours to give. Take an example from a question already settled by the legislature:— In the present anomalous relations between Church and State, it would not be in accordance with this Cardinal Virtue to attempt to deny the rights or claims of self-government which ourselves enjoy, to any one section of society, or to any one form of religious belief, when it is enjoyed by all other forms, by all other sections. Abstractedly, each section and each form have equal claims, if they possess claims; or equal rights, if rights there be, to self-government. Having, therefore, listened to the claims of each section but one, having accorded the right to each religious belief but one, the Cardinal Virtue of Justice would not be satisfied until the last remaining anomaly was swept away, until the English branch of the nation from which— never forget it—our Blessed LORD sprang, was fully represented as members of the commonwealth of England.

Result

Of course, an additional insult was hence

heaped upon, an additional wrong was hence done to the Church of CHRIST by such an act—though only so long and so far only as the Establishment is governed by the popular will. But it may be, that good ensued beyond the fact that abstract Justice was thereby rendered. It may be, that each additional element of religious discord which is cast into the turmoil of our popular assemblage, will make the anomaly the more obvious, will make the antidote the more certain—the anomaly, I mean, of an enfranchised nation in combination with an established Church; and the antidote of a free Church for a free people: the anomaly—I will add—of a Church at once dominant in and enslaved by a nation; and the antidote of a Church asserting supernatural authority alone, which is not bound by the parliamentary will and pleasure of men of any religious belief or of none, of Jews, Dissenters, Unitarians, or Secularists. But, whether or not such may be the case, this is a specimen of one way in which we may exercise Justice towards others, whilst we ourselves are expecting the blessings of Disestablishment.

SERMON
VI.

*to the
Church;
insult and
wrong:
though
possible
good may
result from
the evil.*

IV. Lastly, having exercised Fortitude upon ourselves, Prudence in our efforts upon

*How
Tempe-
rance may*

SERMON
VI.

*be exercised
towards the
Church.*

*Example
of the need
of modera-
tion from
our hopes
and
wishes,*

the State, and Justice towards others, we must learn to cultivate Temperance on behalf of the Church, in the event of securing, and after we have secured, Disestablishment.

It may seem to be somewhat premature to discuss our course of action under contingencies which may be so far distant, and are so uncertain. Yet, it is wise to accustom ourselves to realise a state of affairs which sooner or later must come to pass. And Temperance towards our Mother Church, under the form of Moderation in our expectations, hopes, and wishes, will be no easy Virtue to exercise after we have escaped from the trammels of the State. Neither is the cause far to seek. Thinking, and rightly thinking, that almost any change will be beneficial; thinking, and justly thinking, that the Church, in common with the Nation, should be self-governed—the imagination will not be slow, and certainly will not fail, to conceive a change more perfect than the judgment will admit to be either practicable, or perhaps, at the first, judicious. Hence bitter disappointment will ensue, if the desires in the public life of a Catholic, be not checked by the Virtue of Temperance.

*and the
actual con-*

It is the opinion of many persons whose judgment is entitled to respect, that the

Church herself is yet unfit for the responsibilities of self-government. Observe, I venture to disagree with such opinions of such persons, as being wanting, unknown to themselves, in faith in the Divine presence in, and living voice of, the Church. But, without assenting to the conclusions of such men, the facts upon which they base their conclusions may help us to anticipate disappointment in the Disestablished Church, by the use of Moderation in our imagination, expectations, and hopes. We must not forget, if we attained independence to-morrow, that the whole system, or the larger part of the system, of a State-governed Church, of the system which has been perfected in corruption by the growth of centuries, would be, for at least a generation, and perhaps for longer, the inherited incubus of the self-governed Church. The State-appointed Bishops, would be our Bishops still. The Crown-appointed Cathedral chapters, would be our chapters still. The nominees both of Crown and State in Convocation, who exercise, directly or indirectly, in the synods of the Church, an overpowering influence (in the proportion of nearly four to one), would be the nominee members still. Even the incumbents in our parishes, appointed by Court favour or in-

SERMON
VI.

*dition of
the Church
if she at
once gained
her free-
dom.*

SERMON
VI.

fluence; by episcopal mal-administration or nepotism; by capitular indifference or jobbery; by mere political patronage or power; by the money of our fathers, or, worse than all, by the filthy lucre wherewith some Priests have been known to sell their own souls by purchasing the souls of their people—and, mark you, my Brethren, none of these cases are stated at haphazard—such incumbents would be our incumbents still.

*Faith
needed to
be willing
to meet
such ele-
ments of
self-govern-
ment.*

My Brethren, it needs faith sufficient to move mountains, though it be as a grain of mustard seed, it needs faith, to be willing to encounter self-government from such elements as these. For, remember, that as the Nation is no better, but possibly rather worse, intellectually, morally, socially, politically, than its representative members whom it sends to Parliament; so, the present position of CHRIST'S Church in this land is no better, but possibly rather worse, in matters of faith and in matters of duty, than the elements from which—let us say—Convocation is composed. And I ask, in no unworthy temper of disdain, what Catholic would be willing to be bound by a dogmatic utterance on a moot point in Doctrine; or by the solution of a difficult case of conscience, in Casuistry; or by a decision on

some involved point of our revived worship, in Ritual; or by an adaptation of ancient canon law to modern circumstances, in Discipline—what Catholic would be willing to be bound authoritatively at the hands, as now constituted, of either House of Convocation? A single thought alone can reconcile us to meet, to wish for, to strive after such a fate in prospect—the thought that the present union between Church and State is doing dishonour to our Divine LORD, is doing despite unto the HOLY SPIRIT, is not according to the Will of the Eternal FATHER, and is positively, actively, defilingly harmful to His Spouse, the Church.

These considerations will help us to attain to Moderation in our hopes for the coming dissolution between the Established Religion and the Nation, by the cultivation in the public life of Catholics of the Cardinal Virtue of Temperance.

My Brethren, I have now finished. Two Sermons, even two long Sermons, one at either end of a month, are inadequate to effect more, than to give an outline of a subject which may afford thought for years before it is exhausted. I have attempted only, to set before you certain salient points

Conclusion.

SERMON
VI.

in a vast question; to show you, in some measure, why Disestablishment is needed; to show you, to some extent, how Disestablishment may be met. I am sorry from the nature of the case, and from the order in which the Cardinal Virtues were discussed, that it was impossible to leave the subject for your consideration with a glowing picture of the glories of the Disestablished Church. For myself, I simply and utterly disbelieve, at the outset of her disestablished life, in the truth of any such ideal picture. I disbelieve in anything but a change in the contest of the Church militant, a change from a contest against the State without, to a contest within, against Puritanism, against Latitudinarianism, against Infidelity, and against what may be termed 'Lay-elementarianism' in the Church. Wherefore then, it may be asked, are you so earnest to seek after, why are you so eager to agitate for, why are you so anxious to secure the separation of the almost life-long union in this country between the National Existence and the Religion of Christ? I will endeavour to answer, and with this threefold answer I will conclude—

*Why do
we seek for
Disestab-
lishment?*

*First
reason.*

1. Because I believe it to be the absolute and plainly expressed Will of GOD that Dises-

tablishment should take place in this land, should take place shortly.

SERMON
VI.

2. Because I believe, over and above the public and political evils which have been mentioned, consequent on the union of Church and State, that other and even worse evils of a religious kind, which have not been mentioned, are not less consequent upon the same debased and debasing union. I allude to the religious condition of England at the beginning of the Oxford Movement—which may fairly be symbolised by the condition of the laity at the same date, of which nearly one half had been absolutely lost to the Church, of which a large portion of the other half adhered to the Church, less from devotion, or even from conviction, than from fashion, or habit, or birth.

*Second
reason.*

3. Because I believe that the Catholic Party, under GOD, is destined to fulfil the high and holy mission of Disestablishment. The religious aspect of the English nation has been changed, is being changed under the influence, and by the energy of the Catholic Revival. It would be the crowning labour, it would be the culminating honour, it would be the blessed consumma-

*Third
reason.*

SERMON
VI.

tion of the Catholic Reformation to be the means, in the Divine Economy, of terminating that wicked, immoral, and godless alliance which, under present circumstances, exists under the title of the union of Church and State.

A. M. D. G.

Appendix.

On the Dissolution of the Union between Church and State.*

*DISSOLUTION OF THE UNION THE RESULT OF
INEVITABLE DEVELOPEMENT AND OF IR-
RESISTIBLE CIRCUMSTANCES.*

*John said unto Herod, 'It is not lawful for thee
to have thy brother's wife.'* S. MARK, vi. 18.

OF all the changes which, of late years, have passed over the sentiments of Catholics, none have been, at once, so gradual, so decided, and so widespread, as their change of feeling upon the union of Church and State.

In a certain sense of the word, change has been perhaps one of the most important, certainly one of the most remarkable, notes of the Catholic Revival from the outset to the present day. The course of the Movement, from the little fountain at Oxford to the mighty flood which now fertilises the English Church, and influences the English Nation, has been marked by one continuous, ceaseless, consistent

* This Sermon was written for delivery before the East Somerset District Union of the English Church Union, within the Octave of the Dedication Festival, A.D. 1870, of the Church of S. John the Baptist, Froome Selwood.

change. Change has stamped each feature in its character ; has influenced each element of its teaching. Change has guided each step in the sure path of duty ; has moulded each detail in the doubtful lines of policy. The instruction of the School of thought ; the discipline of the School of action ; the external form in which we offer worship to Almighty God ; the source and limits of authority to which we bow ; and the quality and degree of obedience which we are willing to yield—all these questions in turn have been largely influenced by that abstract element of human affairs, Change.

It is true that the change which follows the footsteps of the Catholic Revival, is a change only in a certain direction, and of a certain kind. The change is ever a change of progression. The change is ever an advance onwards, an advance upwards, from less perfection to more, from one degree of consistency to another. The change has never taken a backward movement, whether it be in faith or duty, whether it be in matters of worship or in principles of order. The Catholic Party, in their nineteenth century crusade against Protestantism, have not been vanquished. They have hardly met with a serious repulse ; never with an actual disaster. Is it a question of doctrine ? There has ever been an advance upwards, from a general or implied acceptance of dogma, to a particular and definite acceptance. Is it a matter of discipline ? There has ever been an

advance onwards from a lenient, if not a lax, adherence to ancient practice, to an observance that is more severe. Is it a point of ritual? Let the services in this Church, in which it is our privilege to join, compared with the highest rendering of Divine worship even ten years ago, make answer as to liturgical progress. Is it a principle of obedience? The pledge distinctly given by, I had almost said urgently exacted from, our leaders, to obey GOD rather than man, under certain contingencies of a legal decision in the Court of Arches, now impending over one whom the Church both loves and honours, bears witness to the ubiquity of the agency of change. And to change, in the abstract, which wears the characteristics suggested by these considerations on the triumphant course of the Catholic Revival in England, we give the name of developement.

The change which has taken possession of the minds of Churchmen on the question before us, is somewhat different in degree if not in kind, is somewhat different in form if not in essence, from the cases we have already considered. This change is in part a cause, and in part the effect, of another change. The mutual relation between the co-ordinate, though not co-equal powers ordained of God, the Temporality and the Spirituality, is fundamentally changed. In what may consist the change of relation we shall see hereafter. But the change of feeling—a change which

does not altogether follow the law of change in doctrine, discipline, ritual, or order—may be concisely stated thus, That, whereas High Churchmen in former years supported the union of Church and State; Catholics, of the present day, are desirous for the dissolution of the union. And I shall hope to show, as in the former cases so also now, that the change which has passed over the sentiments of Catholics is only one additional and practical form of the abstract principle of developement.

This change in the sentiments of Catholics, on the relation which ought to exist between the temporal side of the Spirituality and the spiritual side of the Temporality, is variously viewed by various persons. The modification of opinion, the alteration in policy, the change of feeling—in whatever terms the developement may be expressed—is looked upon with suspicion, aversion, and distrust by many. The change is affirmed to be radical; the policy to be indefensible; its upholders to be beyond the pale of argument; their aims to be simply revolutionary. So speak our enemies. Neither are some of our friends much less sanguine of evil, though their conscience compels an alliance with political renegades who are still fellow Catholics. In their eyes the vacillation, as they think, which is displayed seems to be almost an abandonment of all principle, human and divine. But to myself—may I venture to say, *my* Brethren, to us?—the change which we do not attempt to deny,

and in which we allow ourselves even to rejoice, is defensible and to be accepted on two distinct grounds, which may be shortly indicated by these words—inevitable developement and irresistible circumstances.

The change in policy on the subject of the union of Church and State, which has swayed the Catholic Party of late years, has been asserted to be in part a cause, and in part the effect, of the change which has in the same time passed over the English nation. Hence the two elements of change at work are mutually dependent upon each other, though not to the same extent. For whilst the developement has been largely influenced by the circumstances, the circumstances have been only partially affected by the developement. The question, therefore, of the position which the Spirituality occupies towards the Temporality is a complicated position. But I venture to think that we may obtain a sufficiently clear conception of the involved relation if we consider, apart from each other, the agencies above-named—the inevitable developement and the irresistible circumstances. Hence we have these two points to discuss. We have to show that the freedom of the Church from the tyranny of the State, which now absorbs the minds of Catholics, is at once to be defended and advocated, *first*, as the consistent developement of our own asserted principles; and *secondly*, as the necessary issue of circumstances over which we

neither may nor can exercise any influence. If either theory, or, still more, if both theories could be sustained, as I hold they may be sustained, upon historic and theological grounds, the deep yearning which exists for the dissolution of the union would become general, instead of being only wide-spread ; would be earnestly desired, instead of being languidly hoped for ; would be energetically agitated, instead of being supinely expected. Failing however, at the present, positive proof for either of our two positions, it may be fairly asserted, that if any apology be needed for the reversal, for the desertion, or even for the developement of our principles in this matter, an ample apology may be found in the words of the great Saint, under whose patronage we worship in this church, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife."

Let us consider these two propositions in order :—

I. We have to show, in the first place, that our present longing for a dissolution of the union of Church and State is the consistent developement of our own asserted principles.

The law of developement is an essential feature in a Movement, similar to that in which we play a part ; is essential, as an influence, to those who either guide, or submit to, a Reformation such as the one in which we find ourselves involved. The law asserts its power, over both the persons of the agents and the policy of

their actions, in the Catholic Revival. From the nature of the case it is impossible, either for individual persons, or for the body corporate, to return, at once and immediately, from a debased standard of both, to primitive faith and primitive custom. Hence, in some form, developement is needful to supplement the tentative teaching of an earlier period, with the dogmatic teaching of a period, more advanced. From the circumstances of our position in the world, the course of the Movement, to a large extent, is led, turned, directed, or even checked, not by the act or will of its originators, but by the lines of opposition drawn by its enemies. Hence, again, to complete the circle of truth, organised developement is necessary in order to systematise the lessons of the Catholic School, which, as before from the incapacity of its friends, so now from the hostility of its foes, have been at once desultory and vague, unmethodical and incomplete.

Such are two of the characteristics of developement. The various questions, in dogma and discipline, which agitate men's minds under the outward influence of a religious Revival, are discussed, not according to their legitimate order in the economy of Grace; but either in the accidental manner suggested by chance private and individual opinion, or in the haphazard fashion in which their consideration has been forced by the public will upon the public mind. But there is a third characteristic which is worthy of notice. By the joint influence of the former agencies, developement

is called on to exercise its vocation to harmonise, by the assertion of more definite principles, these discordant elements; and to include in a system, more organised than has yet been possible, these independent quantities. The effect which this effort of developement produces at any given time, upon any given subject, is to magnify out of all proportion some one point of faith or duty at the expense of other and not less important points. The result is natural. An exceptional interest above its deserts, and consequences more favourable than we are justified in expecting, are attached to this phase of developement. And the pulse of the Catholic party is quickened almost to fever speed. But, as when a weight, that we know to be just, is cast into the scale, for the moment disturbs the equilibrium, though the balance is eventually regained; so does the developement of any definite religious principle to its logical results, for a time endanger the equipoise of popular opinion, though after certain oscillations of the fulcrum, the balance at length assumes its wonted level.

These three characteristics of the practical working of the law of developement in the Catholic Revival will be apparent, if we consider the manner in which the Church has acted in the four points respectively which have been above named. We will consider then how, and in what manner, and to what degree she has made certain declarations of doctrine, has practised certain matters in discipline, has adopted

certain features in ritual, has bowed to certain phases of authority. This consideration of the past will not, I hope, be out of harmony either with the Festival we are here permitted to keep, or with the meeting of the Society, which of late years has made its influence to be felt in the Church and nation. Time would fail me to do more than to recall to your memory a few facts in the history of the Movement; but these may serve to teach us wisdom from experience, and to supply hope and confidence in expectation for the future. Their consideration will evidence this truth—That, so far as the parallelism is possible, and in general terms, the Catholic Party has taken, or has been forced into, the same sort of line both of action and argument in the case of the union of Church and State as she has been forced into, or has taken, in the instances which I shall produce, and which are avowedly the outcome of developement. If this be so, my Brethren, then I shall claim at your hands assent to the proposition which stands first in the inquiry, namely—that our present earnest desire for a dissolution of the union is only a consistent developement of our own asserted principles.

We will consider, then, a few salient instances of developement under these four heads—authority, ritual, discipline, and doctrine.

First: Take the case of *Authority*. In the earlier days of Tractarianism, the teaching of the Oxford

Movement on the subject of Church authority was this—that the obedience claimed by and due to Bishops was monarchical, absolute, unquestionable. Obedience was in some cases enforced beyond the bounds of justice, reason, and canon law. The teaching of the Catholic Revival, on the other hand, declares that the Episcopate is equally bound with the Priesthood by the laws of the Church; and that the authority of the Catholic Church is above them both. Here then the world points the finger of scorn at our inconsistency. Not at all, we may reply, not at all are we inconsistent. The inconsistency is apparent only. It is not real. A little deeper thought would show that this seeming departure from former principles is caused only by their developement. Obedience is taught under both phases. But obedience is eventually paid to the higher power instead of to the lower. The authority of the Bishop is developed into the authority of the Church: the Church is declared to be the one and only Court of Final Appeal which may claim to bind the consciences of Catholics, to which they owe, to which they pay obedience. Such is the first instance of the power of developement to which your attention may be recalled. And I ask in passing—Is this case very different in principle from the principle which at one time caused the High Church party to support the union of Church and State, and which causes Catholics now to desire a dissolution of the union?

Secondly : Take the case of *Ritual*. Developement in this case is even more decided than in the case of authority. Consider even common-place examples. Daily Matins and Evensong were once, and still are by some persons, esteemed to be the extreme height to which the Church called her children in the worship of God. Daily Mass is now, and by us, considered to be the least offering of our time, our powers, and our devotion, which is due to the Almighty, and is to be aimed at and worked up to by His faithful Priests. The Canonical Hours are not now held to be comparable to the Holy Sacrifice. They are edifying only. It is essential. Again : At an early period of the Movement the Sacrament of Baptism was administered, with a certain amount of ostentation, weekly ; whilst the Holy Eucharist was still comparatively neglected, and was un-celebrated, as a rule, more frequently than once a month. Now we offer the Holy Sacrifice daily or weekly, and Baptisms are performed as necessity demands. Again : Formerly, it was considered to be a sign of High Church principles (as they were once called), in early days to vest the altar, then to use the surplice in the pulpit, latterly to wear coloured stoles in choir. Now, we feel a definite and very decided want if we see not the Eucharistic vestments at the Altar : we almost expect the dignified cope in processions, and the effective tippet in the stalls. Once more : There was a time—but matters advance so far and so quickly,

that we can hardly realise the mental position of the opponents—there was a time, when we fought for the use of the prayer for the Church Militant, as the weekly termination of an incomplete and mutilated Office, an Office which needed no Priest to recite it, which stood on no Catholic authority, which failed to satisfy common sense, and which has deservedly acquired the contemptuous title of ‘Table-prayers.’ But that time has long passed : and the present day—thank GOD—witnesses to crowds of devout worshippers adoring, without of necessity receiving, their Divine LORD, until dismissed with the blessing. Now, in all these cases, the law of developement may be plainly seen—developement in using a perfect in the place of a mutilated Office ; developement in vesting first the Altar and then the Priest, or in adding dignity first to the Hours and then to the Mass ; developement in giving due honour to the lesser and more honour to the greater Sacrament ; developement in ascending the scale from daily Prayer to daily Sacrifice ;—developement, I repeat, may be clearly seen either in the principle in action, or in the carrying out of the inevitable details. And I ask again, and more emphatically—Is the principle here at work, are the details here worked out, so essentially different from the details and principles of the matter under consideration, that we may affirm of ritual that it is in subjection to developement, but that the question of the union of Church

and State is under the influence of developement not at all?

Thirdly: Observe how, in the course of the Catholic Movement *Discipline* has become developed. For example—The Sacrament of Confession, in theory, was formerly whispered in the ear, or taught in studiously vague terms in sermons. In practice, it was held to be necessary to meet exceptional cases, or to be indulged in as a spiritual luxury occasionally, and was administered in private houses, or in the semi-privacy of the sacristy. Now, its published manuals are manifold, and are sold by tens of thousands; all Catholics employ the Sacrament habitually; many devout souls never receive without first making their confession; and confessionals are publicly set up in church. Again: Weekly reception was, in bygone days, considered as much as most religious-minded persons would accept—reception at any service, at any hour. In these days, communion at early Mass is enforced, communion fasting is enjoined as the universal custom of the world-wide Church—a custom from which Priests are powerless to find authority themselves to escape, or to dispense their flocks. In the case of these two Sacraments the law of developement is not difficult to find. It is not much more difficult to find in the case of our present position with regard to the union of Church and State.

Lastly : If we turn to *Dogma*, it is hard to limit oneself to examples, all more or less pointed, which flood the memory ; which one and all prove our theory of developement ; which one and all suggest, as a solution of the question of disestablishment, the theory of the same developement. I will therefore content myself with saying, that, whilst years ago, respectable orthodoxy was almost confined to a belief in a single Sacrament, and Baptismal regeneration formed the one test of churchmanship, years have also passed since a belief in the Seven Sacraments has been publicly taught ; since the Invocation of Saints and Unction of the Sick have been declared to be practices conformable to primitive usage and helpful to salvation ; since a realisation of Purgatory has been made upon an Episcopal throne, and its importance has been enforced from a Bishop's pen.

The characteristics of developement, as evidenced from a consideration of these cases, and as before suggested, are mainly threefold. Under the circumstances in which developement may be a note of the revival of Catholic dogma and custom ; in the manner in which developement is either unwisely checked by public opposition, or injudiciously hastened by private judgment ; to the extent to which developement ministers to a disturbance of the balance of public opinion—we see in the revival of Religion in our midst,

1. That vital questions are treated, possibly at an inopportune time, certainly in an unmethodical manner, under the influence of unhealthy and non-natural developement.

2. That the elementary principles of our holy Faith, when disallowed of the world, by the publicity which ensues and the opposition which they evoke, unavoidably lead to the enunciation of deeper, and consequently of less palatable truths. And this act of compensative justice overtakes the world through the instrumentality of developement.

3. That public attention concentrated on any definite point of faith or duty always has a tendency to exaggerate the importance of the question under discussion, and to minimise the importance of collateral, or dependent, but not less needful, truths.

Now, my Brethren, can we affirm of these three characteristics, that they influence the discussion of the question which now agitates the Church Party, the dissolution of the union of Church and State? I think that we can. For, in the first place, it is not at all clear to my mind wherefore, at this particular moment, in this particular manner—apart from the leading of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT in developement—the cry for freedom is so deep, so loud, so wide, so long continued. But the fact is evident. However inopportune in order of time, however anomalous in manner of settlement, however caused by hostile influences, the liberation of the Church from the

bondage of the State is now the one great aim of Catholics. And this fulfils the first condition of developement.

Neither is the second characteristic absent. For the fundamental principle in the union of Church and State, which we have ever held, upon which we have ever acted, is this—namely, the co-ordinate, and in several of their spheres the co-equal, powers of both ; the interdependence, and in certain matters the independence, of either ; and, in a word, corporate union, without tyranny and subjection, without dominance and subordination. And since this principle has been disallowed of the world, the Church, by her Divinely bestowed gift of developement, now asserts a higher and less palatable doctrine. She now claims absolute freedom.

Nor does the last condition of enforced developement fail to show its presence and to exert its influence. It cannot indeed be affirmed, that the importance of disestablishment may be exaggerated, for the subject is all-important. But it can be clearly seen, that collateral and dependent truths, and questions which arise at once from division of the union, are disregarded. And whilst the separation of Church and State, as a fact in the future, absorbs our attention, we appear to be singularly indifferent to the subordinate results, which are only less important—the position and prospects, the influence and government of the disestablished Church.

Here then I pause. With these characteristics of developement so fully marked upon the position now assumed by the Catholic Party, I think that I may claim at your hands a verdict in favour of the first proposition which we desired to prove. The present earnest longing which we feel, for the dissolution of the union between Church and State, ensues from the consistent developement of our own asserted principles.

II. The second of the two propositions which demand our attention includes the plea, on behalf of our present position, of 'irresistible circumstances.' It may be re-stated thus—That the impending separation of the Spirituality and Temporality which we long for, is only the legitimate result of circumstances over which we exercise no sort of power or influence whatever. Here we enter at once into a different atmosphere. We leave the domain of theological polemics for the area of national politics and the history of our country. And yet, even here, we may not altogether escape from the influence of the supernatural; even here we are recalled to the truth, that, in dealing with God's Church, the State may not altogether ignore the teaching of Scripture. For, do not the warning words of the Baptist echo in our ears? Is not the lesson which he taught needful for us to learn, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife?"

I do not purpose to insist much on the argument from Holy Scripture in favour of our present desire for the dissolution of the union between Church and State. Yet is the argument too apposite and effective wholly to be neglected. The text may fairly be applied to our position, if we can assent to two theorems, neither of which, alone, admit of doubt, though their application to our own case, in combination, may be questioned. The first point can hardly be denied, if we acknowledge that CHRIST, the King of Glory, has been graciously pleased to become man's Divine Brother. If CHRIST be man's Brother in the abstract, He must be so in the concrete. If He be so to us severally, He must be our Brother collectively. And if He be our Brother collectively, He must be so to us corporately. Hence CHRIST is Brother to the State. In other words, our Blessed LORD has allowed Himself to stand towards the national existence in the relation, supernaturally, of Brother. This is the first point. And the second has only to be stated in order to be at once received. For CHRIST is avowedly the Bridegroom of the Church. The words, then, of S. John the Baptist are applicable to the present position of affairs, if we concede that these propositions, true in themselves, are true also when combined. The State has become corporately one, in the bonds of sinful union with the Church. And hence, of the widowed spouse of CHRIST, and to the earthly kinsman of the Heavenly

Bridegroom, it may be truly said, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife."

The supernatural relationship here claimed between CHRIST, the GOD-MAN, on the one side, and man in his corporate and collective capacity on the other, in the person of the State, if allowed, may be thought to prove too much. If it proves anything at all, an opponent may say, it proves that any alliance between Church and State is of the nature of sin, and, in the language of Holy Scripture, adulterous. Under the conditions of modern Society in which such an union is possible, I should not be careful to deny the truth of this rejoinder. Indeed, I could admit the situation if only an opponent would adhere to the terms as they have been stated. But we must not hastily adopt a conclusion which is intended, or which may be made, to cover a wider field than the words themselves express.

Let us examine this question a little more closely.

An alliance between the Temporality and the Spirituality, as we, personally, have experience of such union, I firmly believe to be sinful in the sight of men ; and, in the sight of GOD, to be adulterous in character. But we must draw a distinction. There may be oneness without union. There may be identity without alliance. It is not impossible to conceive a condition of affairs in which Church and State are almost convertible terms for different parts of the same whole,

for different aspects of one view, for different phases of a single existence. The Jewish Theocracy and Nation is one isolated instance in the history of the world. But in this case we may not affirm that the mere coincidence and co-extension of the Spirituality and Temporality partook of the nature of sin ; nor that any alliance or union, in the modern sense of the words, was entered into between the two elements of one homogeneous whole.

Hence, when persons vainly attempt to place us between the horns of a dilemma, and say, that our argument, in applying the Baptist's words to the union of Church and State in England is either insufficient or superfluous, we may answer thus:—Our argument proves neither too much, nor too little. It does not prove too much ; for there may be again, as there has before been, in what we term the connection between Church and State, there may be sameness without alliance, there may be unity without union. The mutual relation and interdependence of the Temporality and Spirituality, in the early days of both in this country, need not to be discussed now. But it will commend itself to the minds of most of us, that when England was Catholic, when her crown and parliament were Catholic, when her bishops and clergy were Catholic, when her convocation and courts were Catholic, and when her faithful laity were Catholic, the precedent afforded in the union of Church and State cannot possibly bind us now, when,

in the hidden judgments of GOD, the English branch of the Church Catholic has become bound, hand and foot, to a Protestant State.

Neither does our argument prove too little. The comparison I have ventured to make is essentially a Biblical comparison. Our position is not at all without a parallel in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is true that the condition of the Jewish and Christian Churches are exactly reversed. This does not, however, make the parallel the less just; for persons may move in parallel lines in opposite directions. Under a condition of absolute identity of Church and State, Almighty GOD was pleased to designate the denial of His exclusive authority by the name of adultery. Shall we then, under the bond of a mere alliance between the Temporalty and the Spirituality, hesitate to stigmatise the assumption of tyrannical power over CHRIST'S Body, the Church, in the same severe terms? The word may be, the word is, offensive to Christian ears. But is it not fittingly apposite? Is not the sin of State-worship—or the putting the State in the place of GOD, equally with the sin of Idol-worship—or the putting the creature in the place of the Creator, is not State-worship, I repeat, in the language of Holy Scripture, the sin of adultery? Nay, is it not worse? For, must we not make the sentence of S. John the Baptist our own, and say to the kinsman of CHRIST, in the person of the worldly power, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife?"

Assuming then, as I think we may assume, that the words of the Baptist may justly be applied to the State as at present in connection with the Church, let us consider, in conclusion, some of the irresistible circumstances which consequently justify our earnest desire, actively to accomplish the dissolution of the union. We will consider only a few of the circumstances. But even a few will be enough to show that it is not without a cause that the Catholic Party in the Church are now agitating for disestablishment. For what is the constitutional aspect of the union between Church and State? I answer distinctly, it is that of co-ordinate liberty for both, in the respective estates of either. What is the practical aspect of the union, by whatever means it gained its present position? I answer emphatically, it is that of one-sided bondage, in the special domain of the victim or tyranny. The only legitimate result, therefore, of such irresistible circumstances, unless the condition of slavery is to be permanent, is the dissolution of the union between Church and State.

Let us consider how this may be. The union of Church and State in this country may be viewed in the light of a concordat, which, though not signed and sealed, and though unregistered in any extant parchment, is based on immemorial custom, is accepted at common law, has been made cognisable to statute law, and has been legislated on by Act of Parliament. In short, it is part and parcel of the English Constitu-

tion, as both by custom and by law established. But this unwritten concordat, with its sanction of centuries, has of late years, and on the part of the State, gradually and almost imperceptibly, been systematically violated, without being actually repealed. This then, in principle, is that of which we complain. The results of this, in detail, are the irresistible circumstances which have caused the developement in feeling on the part of the Church, which make those who formerly upheld the union now to advocate its dissolution. For, whereas the concordat, as acknowledged by Magna Charta, presupposes the liberty of the Church; the concordat, as interpreted by the national will, secures her bondage.

Is this statement the result of heated imagination, or the effect of exaggerated thought? Let the answers to these few questions in detail decide, where a single answer to a single question would suffice, namely this—Is the Church of GOD in this land at liberty, in any one single phase of her many-sided existence in which she could be fairly estimated to be free? Can any person, before GOD, make answer in the affirmative? If none be able to defend the main position, I will descend to certain particulars. Is then, I ask, the Church of England at liberty to elect her own chief officers? She is not. Is she at liberty to legislate in her own constitutional chambers? She is not. Is she at liberty to decide her own spiritual causes? She is not. Is she, again, at liberty to

teach her own Catholic doctrine, to restore her own Catholic worship, to enforce her own Catholic discipline, to obey her own Catholic authority? Again, if we may judge from the persecution of her faithful children, she is not. Is she, once more, is she at liberty to educate her own people,* to manage her own heritage, to use her own churches, to levy her own taxes, to provide for her own poor, and to cut off from her communion her own sinful children. Once more, she is not. In so unjust, so bitter, so galling a bondage, would to God, my brethren, we had the Prophet's voice to say, even though we shared—nay, rather, that for the Church's sake we might be found worthy to share the Prophet's fate in saying, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife."

In this bondage take only the first three points for further consideration—the case of the so-called Ecclesiastical Courts, of the unreformed shadow of Convocation, of the Church's State-appointed Episcopate.

* As early as the year 1865 the following reply was returned by the Secretary of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education to the question—"Is the 'Apostles' Creed' one of the 'formularies' which a parent . . . might require his child not to be taught?" *Answer.* "The Apostles' Creed being a *formulary* of the Church of England might be required not to be taught." (*National Society's Monthly Paper* for 1865, p. 238.) The last Educational Bill has landed us a long way beyond even a Conscience Clause which esteems the Apostles' Creed a "formulary" of the Church of England, which might be required not to be taught in the Schools of the Church.

I. Take the case of her Bishops.

Can any method of designation be conceived less Apostolic than the present mode of calling one to be a successor of the Apostles? Can any licence to nominate, in so solemn a matter, be more hypocritically and shamelessly unreal and untrue? Can any punishment for not electing the State nominee be more barbarous, more tyrannical, and, under the circumstances, more unjust? Can any form of election—and mark you, my Brethren, this to a Christian is the worst feature of all—can any form of election to a bishopric be more profane and absolutely blasphemous?

Are these hard words? Consider these three facts, and you will not think so. In the chapter-house of a cathedral city, or in a chapel of the Church, the dean and canons solemnly invoke GOD the HOLY GHOST to help them choose, as chief Shepherd in the Church, a Priest who has already been selected for the post in the Prime Minister's study. A pretentious and formal licence to elect is sent by the crown to the clergy; whilst, at the same time, with the summons to make the election comes a letter recommendatory containing the name of the person whom they shall elect. This letter missive is, in fact, a document which practically forbids the power of exercising choice, which takes away the power, and which subjects to heavy penalties all who attempt to act up to the power formally granted. The final cause in the appointment of Bishops is the almost irresponsible will

and pleasure of the leader, for the moment, of the leading party in a popular assembly, of which already, and the number increases yearly, one-sixth part are pronounced enemies of, and aliens to, the Church.

Surely in the case of the election of her chief officers we may justly apply to the State on her alliance with CHRIST'S Church Catholic, the words of S. John the Baptist, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife."

II. Take the Assembly which, technically, is the Church by representation—the Convocation of the Southern Province.

Look at its constitution. If we admit that in the days of the Tudors it fairly represented the Church, we cannot admit the fact in the Victorian age. Perhaps one-half of her ordained priesthood are not represented at all in Convocation. Very nearly three-fourths of its members, either directly or indirectly, are nominees of the government of the day, past or present.

Look at its history. For nearly two centuries, until the last few years, no synodal act has been passed by the Church in her own chambers: whilst latterly, with few exceptions, Convocation has been suffered to meet, certainly only to be again dispersed; has been suffered to debate, apparently only to impede action.

Look at its latest performances. *Firstly*: In defi-

ance at once of common sense, and of all precedent in legislative assemblies, the single casting vote of the Prolocutor (in a house, literally, more than half empty, and by the pressure of an active minority, chiefly of the Broad Church party, of four and thirty clergymen,) has saddled the Church of England, so far as Convocation has the power to saddle her, with a new Lectionary, utterly un-Catholic in character, the details of which it declined to consider, and the plan of which had been formed by a novel, irresponsible, and, as it is worked, unconstitutional body known as a Royal Commission.

Secondly: In the appointment of the New Testament Company (as it is termed) for the revision of the Scriptures, the Lower House of Convocation could find no more suitable members to represent itself than three very pronounced Broad Churchmen and the Prolocutor, who has proved himself to be under the influence of the same party. Of these three members what may be said? One,* by (what must be termed)

* Since this Sermon was written, the deliberate and wanton profanation of the Holy Eucharist in Westminster Abbey, by direct invitation from the Dean of an Unitarian, amongst other heretics and schismatics, to an 'open Communion,' has occurred. The attitude of the Lower House, when the 'scandal' was brought under its notice, is suggestive. The address was received in silence. At a later date, some obscure member proposed that a vote of thanks should be passed to the Dean of Westminster; and the Prolocutor is reported to have said that, in his opinion, it would be a 'graceful thing' to pass such a vote. But the House was not persuaded to this end. A more

the cynical levity if not the flippancy of his remarks on subjects of deep importance to the Church—remarks which are almost invariably followed in the public reports by the repeated use of the word ‘laughter’—has done more than any other member to lower the tone of the debates in Convocation. Another is marked for his bitter hatred and hostility to the Catholic Revival, its work, and its workers ; and for the publication of a laborious and critical edition of the New Testament, of which the commentary is composed mainly of undigested extracts from heretical and semi-infidel German authors. And the third is noteworthy for no public evidence whatever of special capacity for the arduous and difficult office of a reviser of Holy Scripture. No single Catholic, no member with so much as a tendency towards Church principles, has been selected from the

saddening spectacle than the apology for the outrage on the sacredness of the Divine Sacrament, in the Upper House of Convocation, cannot be conceived. Almost each Bishop in succession, with one noble and one partial exception, appeared eager to defend the sacrilege, or to volunteer the information that he would have acted similarly under similar circumstances. Since then one Bishop has made himself remarkable by repeated adherence to his words in Convocation ; and also, when pressed by his clergy to acknowledge his error, for the solecism of pleading respect due to himself as a reason for silence, whilst reverence to His GOD was under discussion. May GOD protect the Church and its holiest Sacrament from further profanation, now that her chief pastors decline to enforce her discipline, or to guard the sanctity of her altar.

ranks of the Lower House of Convocation to serve upon the New Testament Company.

Again, we may fairly say to the State in this case also, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife."

III. Lastly: Take the case of the System of Appeals which now exists in the Church, as by law established.

Has the Church a single Court which, in any Catholic sense, can be called a court Christian, before which a Catholic would willingly consent so much as to appear? Has she a court in which, let us say a Catholic of the type of your own saintly Confessor, good Bishop Ken, would wish to bring a point of doctrine, at the bar of which he would allow himself to plead for a mystery of the faith? Is the Court of Arches such a court; a court which is not constituted after ancient precedent, and which admits of an appeal to a purely secular tribunal in the last resort; a court in which, though it bears the high-sounding title of the Metropolitcal Court of the Province of Canterbury, the Archbishop does not personally sit, and hence cannot personally give judgment, and before which witnesses are not so much as cited in his name?

Here, once more, may be used—or rather, here at length, in figure have been used the Baptist's words, in the Baptist's spirit; for here we leave the region of

the potential for that of the actual. To one, thank God, at last has been given light to see clearly the position of the Church in bondage to the State. To one has been given knowledge to perceive the duty of the Church's children. To one has been given power to decide aright, and strength to carry into execution his decision. For to one—and there is no need to mention such an one to you, my Brethren—to one has been given grace, when hailed before a secular court, to defend himself on the criminal charge of teaching Catholic doctrine; to one, I say, has been given grace to answer the charge in the only way open to him to make reply, by an act of passive resistance in making no answer; and thus, with the eloquence of silence, to say of the Church and to the State, “It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.”

Here, my Brethren, I stop. I have endeavoured to show that the present position of the Catholic Party in regard to Disestablishment is the result of the inevitable developement of their own avowed principles, brought about in the Divine economy, both in Church and State, by inevitable circumstances, over which they exercise no control. How I have succeeded, or whether I have failed, must be left for your decision.

A. M. D. G.

Appendix II.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ORATORY
IN LONDON BY THE SOCIETY OF
THE HOLY CROSS.

On the Limits of Episcopal Authority.*

EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY NOT UNLIMITED.

The Bishop.

Will you reverently obey your Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you ; following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments ?

Answer.

I will do so, the Lord being my helper.

THE FORM AND MANNER OF ORDERING OF PRIESTS.

THE half-yearly Synods of our Society, Reverend Brethren, held upon the Feasts of the Holy Cross, fulfil, with more or less completeness, two objects of varying importance. The more important, is the one in which we are engaged. It consists in the blessing of an united act of worship, offered with almost the highest form of ceremonial of which the English office is patient—an offering which is a comfort to all, and may be suggestive to some of us. The less important, we are about to undertake. After

* A Sermon preached before the Society of the Holy Cross, in the Church of S. Peter-in-the-Docks, E., at the September Synod, on the Thursday within the Octave of the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, A.D. 1870.

our act of worship, we meet for conference. This object is many-sided in its results. A certain amount of sympathy is, and is felt to be, expressed by the fact of our gathering periodically from our several spheres of work. Such meetings intensify a bond of union already existing. They afford support and confidence to many a Priest to find himself at one with a body of clergy of the numbers and influence, such as the Society of the Holy Cross may fairly claim to be. And this, in times of difficulty and doubt, of itself is emphatically good.

But there is a further benefit to be gained from our half-yearly Synods. The members of the Society of the Holy Cross, though at unity among themselves in all weighty matters of Catholic doctrine and practice, are not, and cannot be, absolutely at one in all ecclesiastical questions of secondary importance. In these latter, there is as legitimate a scope for the exercise of a chastened private judgment, as in the former there is no such scope. And of this liberty we avail ourselves. The benefit, therefore, consists in this. We, the members of the Society of the Holy Cross, are enabled to discuss secondary questions, in which there may be diversity of opinion, from the common basis of eternal truth, to which we all bow. By a deductive process, upon elemental facts or mysteries, we can evolve what is probable from what is certain ; we can pass from matters of faith to matters of opinion ; we can descend from principle to policy, from what is right to that which is expedient—in questions of dogma, in details of discipline, in cases of conscience, in points of ritual.

There is much advantage, in my opinion, to be obtained from the power of thus acting. Suffer me to mention how. Where the essentials are accepted, the accidents of the science of Theology may be discussed

with a freedom, plainness of speech, and absence of reserve, which would hardly be possible to allow, and might be dangerous to attempt, if we were less completely, than we are, at one between ourselves. The liability of being misunderstood, the chance of hasty judgment, the trials of temper in debate, are hereby largely diminished. From such accorded liberty, checked from degenerating into licence by the sanctity of this place and the vigilance of our Master, all of us may learn something; and many of us, and I speak for myself, do learn much. And whilst we listen with deference to our superiors, the suggestions even of the least are received with thoughtful attention.

These words contain, at once, an explanation of the course I desire to take, an appeal to yourselves for a patient hearing, and an apology from myself. For, it is not without a purpose that I have made the foregoing observations. Though lately called to join your reverend Society, the duty and honour of preaching before you has been laid upon me. And of many subjects that stir the minds of Catholics, I have chosen one which satisfies the conditions named as being helpful conditions for the consideration of theological questions by the Society of the Holy Cross. The subject involves a deduction from the primary doctrine involved in the text, and leads to a discussion of policy. It is a secondary question based upon fundamental truth. Our decision must be formed by weighing opinions and estimating circumstances. As such I commend to your thoughts the question, its mode of treatment, and the result attained. For, I desire to discuss, GOD helping me, this subject—the Limits of Episcopal Obedience; whether or not there exists, at the present day, any and

what limitation to the authority of Bishops ; the nature, if not the extent, under the circumstances in which we live, of the submission due from the Clergy to their Diocesans.

This is a question to which it is impossible to give an answer that shall be definite, unless it be given in one direction only. But, to return a negative reply, to affirm that there are no limits to Episcopal obedience, will not commend itself, Reverend Brethren, to your judgment. I assume, then, that there are limits. And I shall endeavour to set before you facts, and deductions from facts, which will tend to decide the degree, if not the measure, of our obligations in this matter. The discussion, from the nature of the enquiry and my own deficiencies, must needs be imperfect. It is only under the force of conviction that the subject ought to be discussed, even imperfectly, that I have made the attempt. But I do not purpose to take more than a single point in so wide a subject. I shall consider the limits of obedience from the stand-point of expediency—expediency based upon the many-sided position in which, by the permissive Will of GOD, and from no choice of our own, we find ourselves placed.

Expediency appears to be the only ground upon which a question such as this can, practically, be discussed. There are a large number of conditions to be examined before we can decide, in general or particular, in argument or action, either the kind or the degree of obedience which the Priesthood is bound to yield to the Episcopate. For instance, as a question of casuistry, these amongst other points have to be considered—the respective position and character of the principals ; the form in which the obligation meets us, whether as counsel or command, whether it be to act or to abstain from action ; the results

•

of obedience, whether it affects ourselves only or others, whether it goes counter to, or accords with, higher responsibilities. In all these circumstances expediency plays its part. And if we pass on from private to public considerations, we shall find that expediency will enter deeply into the discussion. Here we shall have to inquire what view the ancient Church took of the question, and how it is understood in modern times ; what would be our duty under different conditions of Church and State, severally and in union, and what our duty may be under the existing conditions of both ; how we must act in reference to the position which the Episcopate occupies in the State, and to the line of action it has taken in the Church ; how we must decide, when we consider the attitude of our Bishops towards the Oxford Movement in the past, and when we thence deduce its sentiments towards the Catholic Revival in the future. To these last-named and more public grounds of discussion I now invite your attention. It will be well to treat so delicate a subject, as far as possible, impersonally : and I shall hope to say nothing for which I have not authority. It will be wise, in a matter of so much difficulty, to speak suggestively only, and shortly, with diffidence and without metaphor. If I shall seem to act otherwise, I apologise by anticipation.

The question of the Limits of Episcopal Authority, whether we consider its nature or extent, is of more than doubtful uncertainty. Like most other subjects which divide Catholics, it admits of at least two different solutions. There are, and always have been, those whose sympathies lead them to hold the authority of the Bishop in high estimation, and the position of the Priest comparatively in light esteem. There are, and always have

been, those who believe that the germ and source of the working power of the Church is lodged in the Priesthood, and that the Episcopate is only a developement in one single point from the order of Priests. On this point authorities appear to be evenly balanced on either side ; and quotation may be poised against quotation with impartiality. If it be true, as some Fathers have summarised the question, that where no Bishops are, there can be no Church of CHRIST ; it is not less an axiomatic dictum of Catholicism, that there can be no Church without the order of the Priesthood. And, if again, by the Fathers, Priests are adjured to do nothing apart from their Bishops ; on the other hand, the chief Shepherds, in not less decided terms, are exhorted to do nothing without their Clergy, the Pastors of the Flock of CHRIST.

Such is the variable language of antiquity upon the respective claims to mutual deference and interdependence of the Episcopate and Presbyterate. And if we turn to modern times, even to our own day, the contrast is equally evident, though expressed in a somewhat different manner. The custom which necessitates the delivery of an Episcopal charge once in three years, in the case of seven and twenty English Bishops causes the publication of several charges yearly. Few Bishops' charges escape from the expression of an opinion that, in these times of agitation and uncertainty, the Clergy would do well more and more to betake themselves to their Ordinary for Episcopal decision in all matters of difficulty. Many Bishops, indeed, urge their claims to additional legal powers from the State, to enable them to enforce such an opinion upon their Clergy. And this is only one form which the sentiment takes among ourselves, that the Priest should do nothing apart from his Bishop. The form which the opposite theory takes, in

our day, namely, that the Priesthood, as distinct from the Episcopate, is the real, living force and energising influence for the origination and perfecting of active work in the Church of GOD, is somewhat different, and certainly is more practical. I shall have cause to touch upon this part of the subject further on; but may now say, that this theory, in actual results, may be condensed into two words. For, under GOD'S favour, the work performed by the Priesthood alone in the Church of England of late years, is the result attained by the 'Catholic Revival.'

No doubt there was once a time, and there may be a time again, when this antagonism, real or supposed, did not exist, or may exist no more. In a perfectly developed phase of the Church, with Apostolic discipline and Catholic doctrine; at an early stage of its career, before the spirituality was either patronised by, or in subjection to, the temporality; when men's lives were made simple by the absence of luxurious civilization, and men's faith was quickened by the opposition of the world—we can easily imagine, even if our imagination be mistaken in supposing, a condition of affairs in which the limits of Episcopal obedience were absolutely illimitable. Neither, if we cause our imagination to travel forward, instead of backward, may we fail to conceive a similar state of things if the Church of England, in GOD'S providence, should once more become Catholic, to the extent of having a Catholic laity, a Catholic clergy, and a spiritual existence, disunited from the secular power, in faith and morals Catholic. In such a case we may unhesitatingly claim for the godly admonitions of the Episcopate an extent without a boundary.

But such a claim cannot with justice be upheld now. We cannot allow to our Bishops unlimited authority

under existing conditions, either apart or in union of both Church and State. If we consider for a moment our position, morally, socially, politically, ecclesiastically, we shall be the better able to judge. Our position, to speak plainly, amongst others not less anomalous, consists of the following factors. A Church, with overpowering advantages, as the world thinks, spiritual and temporal, which exercises less influence in the nation than any other Church in Christendom. A Clergy, of social position and means, of intellect, education, and refinement without precedent, which yet possesses no acknowledged power in society as Priests. An Establishment not only *de jure* in corporate union with, but *de facto* in slavish subordination to a State, which by a godless Education Bill has now cast aside almost the last links of a national Christianity. A Body of CHRIST, even His Spouse, tyrannised over by a popular Assembly, of which upwards of one-sixth part, and the proportion is advancing, consists of open foes to the faith. An Episcopate nominated by the leader for the moment of the leading faction of the day in this Assembly—a leader who may be of any religion, or of none. Houses of Convocation, the Church by representation, in nearly the same imperfect condition in which they existed at the time of the Tudors; three-fourths of which, in our Province, are composed of state nominees of the first or second degree, and one-fourth of which—with shame be it spoken—represent the monetary interests of the beneficed Clergy only. Ecclesiastical Courts, so called, of which the inferior possesses indeed a Church style and title, and is administered solely by a layman; of which the superior is essentially a Secular Court, created by Act of Parliament. Lastly a laity, in a vast proportion of the empire, external to the Church; honeycombed with heresy and unbelief,

eaten up with immorality and sin ; whose virtues at the best are on a par with those of heathen morality ; whose vices, in the domestic circle, in mercantile transactions, and in public life, fall lamentably below such a standard.

Now, does any one enquire, wherefore it is impossible for Catholics to admit illimitable authority to our Episcopate under conditions of modern society, in both Church and State, such as these ? I answer thus :—The Episcopal bench, under a union of the Spirituality with the Temporality unparalleled in the annals of Christianity—the Episcopal bench, I say, is the legitimate product of these factors, is the natural developement of such a state of affairs, is the positive outcome of this system. Does this seem a hard sentence to pronounce ? Consider, Reverend Brethren, the position ; and then declare, is it, or is it not, in your judgment, a just estimate ? Mark you, we offer no opinion on the private or personal lives of our chief Pastors. We deal with them simply as public characters, and as the representatives of certain conditions. We own that many of them are distinguished men ; that some of them are learned men ; that all of them may be holy men. They are, or may be, good administrators, judicious counsellors, active diocesans. They are, or may have been, elegant Greek scholars, or widely read in German metaphysics ; learned Hebraists, or acute New Testament critics ; successful schoolmasters, or popular College tutors. They are, or may have been, accomplished musicians, or patient observers of natural history ; notorious essayists, or impartial historians ; useful Educationalists, or cultivated Ecclesiologists ; well born, or well connected, or polished and graceful courtiers.

But, as Churchmen, as Ecclesiastics, as Bishops in the Church of GOD, what can we say of them as an Order ?

We can but say this—that one and all accept the present condition of our disorganised Church as, on the whole, justifiable. Their status, as high officers of State in the Establishment, shows their acceptance; for they take office, not as avowed reformers, but as pledged partisans; not as zealous restorers of ancient purity, but as eager defenders of existing anomalies, of which one has lately affirmed—and he one of the most eminent—that the greatest possible misfortune would be their overthrow. They are, it may be, good results, but still, they are results of a bad, vicious, immoral system; of a system which is utterly un-Catholic; of a system which they do absolutely nothing to amend, because they hold that, as a system, it may not be amended. And this is one reason wherefore we cannot admit illimitable authority to our Bishops.

But, let us take another view of the subject. Let us turn from theory to practice. It may be admitted that we are unable to yield unlimited obedience to the Episcopate, when viewed abstractedly, as the culminating point in the Church, of an ungodly and anti-Christian civilization in the State; to the Bishops, when considered individually as the most favourable examples which an un-Catholic phase of existence has upheaved from below, above the surface of the Establishment. Are we, then, prepared to yield unlimited obedience to our Ecclesiastical governors upon any other plea? Are we enabled to accord it, by reason of the superiority to adverse circumstances displayed by the bench of Bishops? Can we assent to it, on account of the line which they take in all matters within their special province, in all matters affecting the Church, when they have reached the highest honours in the State—a line which proves our Bishops

are influenced by the most consistent principles of Catholic duty, by the deepest insight into Catholic truth ?

Here, Reverend Brethren, we must distinguish between the Ecclesiastical official in the Establishment, and the Christian Bishop in the Church. We may fully admit, that in all which concerns the outer organisation, and the more secular side of diocesan supervision, as to services, schools, conferences, even confirmations, we have much for which to be thankful. But on the main question of episcopal zeal for souls, immortal souls ; of episcopal care for the Church, CHRIST'S Spouse, let the history of the Oxford Movement, let the developement of the Catholic Revival make answer. Is it an exaggeration to say, that every single Bishop, during the last forty years, twenty years, ten years, has pronounced, more or less *ex cathedrâ*, against one or more points of doctrine, ritual, or practice of the Catholic Faith, as restored, point by point, to the English Church. I think not. It is certainly no exaggeration to say, that most Bishops have inveighed against many points ; that many Bishops have declared against some points. Hence, if we take the English Episcopate as a whole, if we view the Catholic Faith as a whole, we arrive at the lamentable conclusion, that, as an order, our Bishops have pronounced against the Catholic Revival from beginning to end. It is true, and we thank GOD for it, that such enunciation has been individual, not corporate ; that such declaration has been delivered by instalments, and not as a whole. And herein is at once our safety in practice, and our support in argument. For the same facts apply, in a similar manner, to the disallowance by the Priesthood of Episcopal claims to autocracy. But, in their individual capacity, there is no point in faith or works, which are now being revived in our Church by GOD'S manifest intervention,

against which our Fathers in GOD have not pronounced personally or by letter, by counsel or command, in public or private, as friend or Bishop, through the daily papers, or through the medium of a charge.

It would not be difficult to draw up a schedule of matters of dogma, ritual, or discipline taught by Priests of the Catholic School, and to append thereto the names of the Bishops of the Establishment who, with more or less authority, have condemned themselves, and forfeited all title to unlimited obedience, by condemning these developements. No developement is too small to secure, none is too sacred to enforce, exemption from Episcopal condemnation. Nothing is too small, upwards from genuflection, and the sign of the Cross. Nothing is too sacred, downwards from the doctrine of the Real Presence. Is it a picture of the Madonna; is it flowers upon the altar; is it a cross of evergreens; is it processional banners; is it a sculptured Image of the Crucified upon a wall? They must be sacrificed to popular Protestant prejudice. Is it the doctrine of Sacramental Grace, the discipline of Confession, the adoration of our Lord on His Altar, veneration of Saints and Angels, a belief in an Intermediate State of purification? They must not be taught to the Catholics of England.

The most elementary and harmless matters, and matters which only affect the doer or holder, appear to be objects of dislike to the English Episcopal mind in general, equally with the most demonstrative and aggressive. The surplice in the pulpit has been objected to equally with the chasuble at the Altar. A few drops of pure water in the mixed Chalice is condemned equally with clouds of incense. Missions to the godless have been discountenanced, aye, and positively hindered, equally with non-communicating attendance. The practice of

habitual confession is publicly protested against, and by the same Bishops who equally desire to prohibit the renewal of Baptismal vows. Whilst the non-recognition of Episcopal jurisdiction, equally with avowed membership in a Religious Order for deepening the spiritual life, have been visited, by two Bishops respectively, with a punishment due only to the deadliest heresy, or the worst immorality—inhibition to preach the Gospel. This last case is at once so childish and so monstrous, that, had we not the Bishop's own letter to assure us of the facts, we could not have believed them.* It comes nearly home to us,

* The following are the Bishop of ——'s words, as printed in the public papers, in answer to a memorial professing deeply to regret the offence taken which led to the inhibition of the Rev. ——: 'To this gentleman personally I express no objection, *for I know nothing whatever about him.* It is to him in his character of "the Superior of the Society of the Holy Ghost" that my objection is raised.' Can anything be at once so weak as this avowal, and so frivolous as this objection. To inhibit a Priest with this avowal and upon such grounds is simply want of justice. A Bishop inhibits a Priest of whom he knows *nothing whatever*, because he objects to the Priest in his character of a Superior of a Religious Order! But the Bishop is not content to state one reason only; a second reason for inhibition is expressed later on. 'The title, I know,' the Bishop affirms, 'has given great offence to many attached members of the Church in my diocese.' Hence, because 'attached members' of the Church take irrational offence at a harmless religious title which a Priest assumes—or rather, in this case, is advertised by a Church Society—a Bishop is found capable of the gross injustice of inhibiting a clergyman of whom he knows 'nothing whatever;' and others are found sufficiently servile to episcopal tyranny to refer to the reversal of the injustice as the '*kind withdrawal*' of the Bishop's inhibition.

A similar instance of Episcopal injustice lately occurred in another diocese, in which a Bishop condemned a Priest in a certain matter, at the same time owning that he was ignorant of the facts of the case. Yet he condemned the Priest notwithstanding his ignorance! When will the Episcopal order learn to cultivate, in their dealings

Reverend Brethren, as being the experience of one of our own members of Episcopal consistency. For, observe, the evidence is contained in the letter of a Bishop, who from his seat in Convocation, though unconcerned in the outrage, could dare to offer his sympathy to those, and to affirm that he would have acted exactly as they acted, who invited a minister of the Socinian unbelief to the Altar of our GOD.

These words call to mind a humiliating scandal, calamitous beyond any Ecclesiastical scandal of our age. I name it only, lest any should think that it had been overlooked. Fortunately, the argument does not oblige us to consider either its heinousness or its results. For, we are not considering Episcopal authority by the light of Episcopal maladministration in general, but only from the particular stand-point of opposition or antagonism to Priestly work in the Catholic Revival. Such is the intention with which this statement, painful and sad as it is to make, has been prepared—a statement which falls short of the reality of the number of instances quoted, and which does not exceed plain matter of fact in their allusion. And to what conclusion do these facts commit us? It is not too much to say, that the Oxford Movement would never have even partially succeeded in bringing back the Church of England to Catholicity, had not the leaders of the Movement held to and acted upon

with Clergy of the Catholic School, the cardinal virtue of justice? Until they practise this virtue, how can they expect their Priests to follow with a glad mind their Bishops' admonitions? Surrounded as they are by partisans and followers only too ready to flatter and to please, our Bishops are not aware of the feelings of distress and indignation to which such acts give rise in the minds of those who venerate deeply the Episcopal office, and resent deeply its degradation.

large, though possibly ill-defined, limits to the theory of Episcopal obedience.*

The principle held to and acted upon by the leaders of the Movement, must not be disavowed by their disciples in the Revival. To do otherwise than to heartily accept such principles would be neither generous to the past, nor wise for the future. It is not generous to the past—for we have, in such a matter, no moral or divine right to avail ourselves of results which were obtained by false principles. It is not wise for the future—for unlimited obedience will not conduce to the completion of the system to which we are compromised. Neither is it honest and manly at the present. For, it must not be forgotten, that the results of the Oxford Movement were not acquired by submission to Episcopal authority, but were purchased by opposition to it. To assent, then, at the present time, to the principle of unlimited obedience, is not even to avail oneself languidly of truths and practices secured after much opposition; but it is wantonly to give up almost every feature in Divine Service, to abjure almost every doctrine of our holy Faith, which have been gained by the struggle of well-nigh half a century. That such is the issue will be allowed when we consider this—It is not the developement alone of the Revival of

* The question of obedience to authority in the early days of the Movement is discussed in the foregoing sermon, 'On Dissolution of the Union between Church and State.' At the outset of the Oxford Movement, obedience was claimed for the Church through the Bishops. Workers in the Catholic Revival have now, alas! to show obedience to the Church in spite of the Bishops. The simple-minded conviction that the Catholic Faith and Practice would influence the Episcopal order as it has leavened the Presbyterate, has been rudely dispelled. The continued disappointment of years has made us almost indifferent and callous to Episcopal opposition. We now only strive to become forgetful of it.

1870 that the Episcopate ceaselessly protests against. The Bishops have pronounced against each succeeding developement from the publication of the 'Tracts for the Times' to this hour. We should, therefore, have to give up, not a more ornate form for a less ornate form of worship, nor a more Catholic mode of teaching for a less Catholic; but we should have categorically to renounce every successive developement of both dogma and ritual, until we returned to the original germ whence we became developed, the germ of a cold, naked, heartless, and unlovely Protestantism. Are we then prepared for such a consecutive capitulation? Are we willing to become worse than the *traditores* of old, to deny one by one the elements of GOD'S Truth, to yield point after point of Christian practice, to abandon Catholic worship piecemeal, to stamp out the instincts which we either feel within ourselves, or, by GOD'S Grace, have implanted in others. If we are equal to this, if we ignore the conquest made for us, if we disallow the success won by ourselves, mark this, Reverend Brethren, we possess no consistent self-respectful footing in the Church of England.

But, if we adopt the position, that unlimited obedience to Episcopal authority has not hitherto been, and is not at the present, the energising principle of the Oxford Movement, we must admit, in the future, that it must not be the motive power of action in the Church of GOD in this land. Consider how much has yet to be done, ere we stabilitate our conquests over Protestantism, or, still more, ere we re-Catholicise the Church of England. How much have we to do, in the doing of which it is, alas! certain that we shall have to act upon the theory, that the authority of Bishops is limitable. For instance, we have to liberate the Church from the tyranny of the State. We have to secure the freedom of the election of Bishops.

We have to remodel Convocation, and to extend its franchise, under certain conditions, to all ordained priests ; and to abolish secular judgments in the Ecclesiastical Courts of the Establishment. We have, again, to make confession the ordinary custom of the masses, and to teach them to use Eucharistic worship. We have to establish our claims to Catholic Ritual in its highest form. We have to restore the Religious Life, to say Mass daily, and to practise Reservation for the Sick. Looking at these and other more or less pressing needs of our Communion, I confidently ask, Can these and such-like wants, in the providence of GOD, be restored to His afflicted, and, to this extent, indigent Church, if we admit the theory of limitless obedience, not, observe, to the Episcopate combined in a Sacred College, but to any, or to all the individual members of the bench of Bishops?

Such, then, is the conclusion at which we have arrived. The Limits of Episcopal Obedience, at the present day, are limitable. They are limitable, from the circumstances of the times in which we live, from the anomalous existing conditions of society, both in Church and State. They are limitable, by reason of our subordination to a bench of Bishops which is the legitimate outcome of a system unparalleled in the history of the Church. They are limitable, on account of the actively hostile attitude of several generations of Bishops to the advance of the Oxford Movement. They are limitable, again, because the principles of the Catholic Revival, from the first, have been founded and worked out upon the opposite hypothesis. They are limitable, lastly, because we accept the results, and hence may not deny the law, of the great work on which we are engaged ; because, accepting the issues, we desire by the same law to carry on the blessed

and hopeful labour of Catholicity, by the help of the Good LORD, to a more blessed, because a more perfect and a more consistent consummation.

If any wish to go further, if any desire to pass from principle to practice, from outline to detail, I would persuade some member of the Society of the Holy Cross more learned than myself to devote himself to the subject, and to place the results before the Society at the May Synod. For myself, I am content to have been permitted to indicate suggestively a line of argument, which I earnestly believe to be based upon absolute truth, and to be elaborated in godly expediency. I am content to have been able to state my deliberate conviction, that, in the event of Episcopal obedience being placed in comparison either with the avowed theories, or with the accepted issues of the great Catholic Revival in the Church of England, we must respectfully but without hesitation, we must firmly but with much humility affirm, that the authority of an individual Bishop is not unlimited.

A. M. D. G.

On the Establishment of an Oratory in London.*

*A PAPER READ BEFORE THE MAY SYNOD, AND
PRESENTED, WITH ADDITIONS, TO THE SEP-
TEMBER SYNOD, OF THE SOCIETY OF THE
HOLY CROSS.*

THE Question of the Establishment of an Oratory in London under the auspices of, and in connection with, the Society of the Holy Cross has already been discussed at one of its monthly Chapters. The subject has been thought worthy of further consideration at one of its two annual Synods; and I have been entrusted with the duty of placing the matter before you to-day. The question has also been considered apart from the Society, and independently of each other, by many persons, both by some whom I have consulted, and by some who have conferred with me, as well as—later information has shown—by others without the Society. It appears, therefore, to be probable, that the minds of a large number of persons have been turned, by GOD, to this subject. And a question, such as this, which has been made a matter

* The Society of the Holy Cross is in no way responsible for the opinions expressed in the following pages. The writer is alone responsible. The Society only affirmed that the establishment of an Oratory, in the abstract and apart from all details of this paper, was deserving of consideration. The following paper was printed in order to afford opportunity for such consideration. [At the September Synod of the Society of the Holy Cross, upon the presentation of the paper, a Committee was appointed for the further consideration of the subject.]

of thought to many persons, is worthy, at the least, of our careful consideration ; and perhaps may be worthy, if held to be right and feasible, of being carried into practice.

In order to make the statement to be placed before you as systematic, clear, and concise as possible, it will be well to divide the remarks, which I propose to offer for your consideration, into six parts, and to treat severally,

I. Of the establishment of an Oratory, in the abstract ;

II. Of its establishment in London ;

III. Of the proposed site of the Oratory ;

IV. Of its establishment by the Society of the Holy Cross ;

V. Of some results of its establishment ;

VI. Of the legal and ecclesiastical position of the Oratory, when established.

I. The idea which appears to underlie the thoughts of many, on the Establishment of an Oratory in London by the Society of the Holy Cross, so far as I have been able to judge of and sympathise with them, and expressed in my own words, is as follows : That the Catholic Party, both as a School of Thought, and as a Source of Action, has hitherto been content, perhaps has been forced, to exist upon sufferance only ; but that the time has now come when it should be prepared to act for GOD, either in virtue of its own innate vitality, or upon the strength of its own acquired power. The Catholic Party has been placed, and has acquiesced in being placed, both in doctrine and discipline, both in matters of faith and matters of practice, in a defensive attitude ; but it is high time that it should be freed from a position unworthy of a Movement which, when developed, is at once missionary and refor-

matory. The School of Thought has been wont to advocate, specially in its earlier days, a certain indistinctness in teaching, and has exercised a certain reserve in communicating doctrine, which no doubt was at once expedient and right in the days of its infancy. The Source of Action, though it has effected much to raise in England the standard of Religious Worship, has voluntarily abstained from adopting the highest form of Catholic Ritual; and has hitherto contented itself with accepting as its standard a development considerably below the level of our lawful inheritance. But the time has long passed when such a course, either in dogma or ritual, could be enforced by rightfulness or expediency; and we are now called upon to assert the Truth in act and word in its complete and distinct entirety, and to assume for our Divinely inspired teaching and action an aggressive attitude in the World.

As a matter of fact the Catholic Party forms an element in the Nation. The element cannot, with justice, be called large. It cannot be termed, at the present moment, politically powerful. But, socially, it is sensibly, widely, and rapidly gaining ground. And religiously, it undoubtedly possesses supernatural power, not its own, which, without exaggeration, is extensive, and, even by enemies, is admitted to increase daily. With every qualification, however, the School of Thought and Source of Action form an element in the English polity. We possess our representative men, who are more or less at one with us, in each division of our many-sided state of existence. Such men not only occupy definite positions in their several lines of life, but they occupy definite positions in the Empire, of dignity, of influence, of authority, and of power. We can point with satisfaction to those who, to a greater or a less extent, acknowledge subjection to the Catholic Revival in

places of authority in Church and State, in the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation, in both Houses of Parliament, in past and present Ministries. And it may be asserted, that no Government in the future, either Conservative or Liberal, will be carried on without the same element being present in its composition. We exercise, moreover, an influence on the Bench—though not so large as we shall hereafter exercise, when the principles which govern Church law are more widely accepted by non-ecclesiastical lawyers—and a more powerful influence at the Bar. The public Services, Civil, Military, and Naval, are largely recruited from our numbers. In Mercantile life, in Business, in Trade, we are well represented. Amongst Artisans and the industrial, wealth-producing Classes, and the Poor in general, we are even stronger. And far and wide is the Catholic Movement felt, and being felt is esteemed a blessing, in the million homes and ten million hearths of England.

It is within our power, then, to make our voice to be heard, our influence to be felt, our judgment to be esteemed, and our authority to be respected for good, wherever the English tongue is spoken. We possess all the appliances for these results, either in a state of embryo, or in a condition which only needs development and perfection to render them practically efficacious. We have our Organs of Opinion—such as they are, and utterly unworthy of our intellectual, social, and religious position, as I believe them to be. We have our Societies, our Corporations, and our Organisation—imperfect as they are, desultory as their effects may appear, and disunited as they sometimes prove to be. And the time has come—surely the time has more than come—when we should demand to be recognised as a substantive power and influence in the State.

After an existence of more than a generation—for our origin may be dated from the publication of the ‘Christian Year,’ upwards of forty years ago—it seems to many persons that we may fairly take the initiative more uncompromisingly, that we should not be content with a mere state of toleration, to which alone, up to the present time, we have aspired. To myself, if I may offer an opinion, it seems, and as before GOD I say so, that we *ought* more decidedly to take the initiative. As the subject we have to consider is the Establishment of an Oratory in London by the Society of the Holy Cross, my observations do not overpass that point. But keeping to this point alone, it may be affirmed that, in the public ministrations of our Sacred Office, we have failed to do as much as we might have performed. We have been satisfied to secure, here and there, a Church, a Chapel, or a District devoid of both. We have considered ourselves fortunate to obtain possession of a District Church, where the Parish Church was closed against us ; or to secure a footing in out-of-the-way places, or in places neglected by others, or in places too poor to attract competition. We have, as it were, taken up a position in No-man’s-land, and have founded to ourselves Churches, established Schools, and built Clergy-houses on neutral ground, where none could gain-say our title of tenure. And so far good. More could hardly be expected at the outset of a Movement essentially reformatory in character and work. Reformers must be content, and we were and are content, to begin our career quietly and humbly. It would have been of serious harm to the cause had it been otherwise. To escape popularity, and to ensure neglect, are fair grounds for securing disinterestedness and sincerity.

You will not, for a moment, suppose that I do otherwise than give honour to all such efforts made on behalf

of GOD'S Church and GOD'S Poor ; nor that I should venture to say, that those who made such efforts were in a position to do otherwise than they did. I only hold that now, after nearly half a century of revived work in England, we probably are, or certainly ought to be, in a position to effect more, far more, infinitely more. Progress onwards, however, presupposes either a starting-point, whence to begin ; or progress already made, which may be improved. In contemplating further advance on a position already attained, I wish it to be distinctly understood, that (if I may venture to praise where I have no right to criticise) I allow all possible credit to those from whose starting-point we may again advance, or whose progress we are enabled to follow up and complete. But on this question, we all, probably, agree, that the time has now arrived when the line of tactics formerly adopted, must be abandoned for a course of action at once bolder and more consistent, more demonstrative and less compromising. In GOD'S Strength, and under His Providence, we must act with less timidity and diffidence ; and as against the World, we must act more openly and aggressively. We must not be, we are not, content with a mere hole-and-corner existence, upon sufferance. We are capable to, and must, come forth from the catacombs of comparative obscurity, and show ourselves to our fellow Christians in the full blaze of GOD'S daylight. We must not be, we are not, content to be at the mercy either of complacent and impressible churchwardens, or of sympathetic and hearty congregations, or of public prestige and influence, based perhaps on former work. We are capable to, and must, stand upright and alone, without the dangerous, uncertain, and changeful support of any of these three forms of co-operation. We must not be, we are not, again, content with that worse than unprincipled

form of existence, which is sometimes put forward with approbation, but which altogether ignores the authority, position, and functions of the Priesthood—that we are forced onwards and upwards, and held in the position we have reached, through the instrumentality of the laity. That the question is a layman's question may be admitted; but not in this form. We are capable to, and must, act upon higher, purer, bolder Catholic motives, upon less interested, less conventional, less timid Catholic principles. Once more, we must not be, we are not, content to be dependent upon Episcopal favour or patronage, upon Episcopal shortsightedness or forbearance, even upon Episcopal influence and authority. We are capable to, and, in GOD's holy Name, we must, act of ourselves, and, if it be needful, by ourselves, on our own responsibility and on our own authority, in virtue of the sacred and very definite commission given us, severally as well as corporately, individually as well as generally, as Priests of His Church, by GOD Himself.

These thoughts, briefly, but not without much consideration, put together, will tend, if accepted, to show that the Establishment of an Oratory, to be hereafter described, either in the form proposed, or under some similar conditions, is no imaginary necessity. Its need at once exists and arises from the position of the Catholic Party as it now finds itself placed with regard to Society at large, which it has always to influence ; to the State, to which it is now unequally yoked ; to the Church, whose only legitimate offspring it claims to be, and whose only dutiful child—despite all shortcomings, failures, and actual sins—it undoubtedly is. As such, the idea, I earnestly believe, is deserving of the counsels, the efforts, and the prayers of the Society of the Holy Cross.

II. The question—Wherefore should the Oratory be established in London? is not a difficult question to answer.

London is yearly becoming, more and more completely, what Paris formerly boasted itself to be, and to a certain extent still may be considered, the point towards which, with ever-increasing attraction, concentrate the efforts of the heart, the head and the hand, as well as the will of this great Nation. Many causes are at work to produce this result. The unwonted, and abnormal additions to the population of this ‘province covered with houses,’ as it has well been described by a foreigner, may be one cause. The converging influences towards—some of which are intelligible, some unreasonable, and all undeniable—despite the sanatory, physical, if not moral repugnances from, London, which concentrate the intellect and talent, the science, art, and letters, the learning and education, the theory of all kinds and practice of many kinds, upon this huge centre of English culture, refinement and civilisation, is another cause. The facilities in time and money, and the conveniences in ease and comfort, of modern locomotion, is a third. Whilst the last that need be mentioned, is the fact which—for more reasons than may be shortly given—has almost ceased to be represented by a figure of speech, that every one comes once a year to London; and that yearly the metaphor more and more nearly represents the actual truth. Hence, as the permanent centre, as well as the temporary abode, of the moral, physical, and intellectual forces of the nation, London to a large extent at once directs and influences, and also rules and governs England. And amongst other ways in which this law holds good may be mentioned, as not the least noteworthy, and as most nearly connected with our present enquiry, the case of the Revival in our midst of the Catholic Religion.

The venerable and learned University, under whose shadow—both literally and in figure—the Revival originated, and in whose precincts, for many years, it struggled for the mastery, as a matter of fact, has long since lost a lead to which it never avowedly aspired, and which we must thank GOD heartily it never, for any appreciable length of time, definitely held. This remark is made in full and hearty recognition of all that we owe, of all that the Church owes, to the Early Tractarians. The Catholic Reformation in the Church of England simply and entirely owes *everything* to the Oxford Movement. Yet, this sense of obligation and gratitude must not blind us to the truth, that it has been good for the Movement that its centre of action has been removed, geographically, from the provinces to the metropolis; has been transferred, from a provincial town, albeit a University city, to the capital of the empire. This migration (in the language of *Alma Mater*) has given to a Movement which possessed but a local name and place, (in the language of the Empire) a cosmopolitan position and character. And this development in the status and condition of the phase of religious life which we are considering is delicately, yet clearly, marked in the change of title which has been imperceptibly, but surely, assumed for the phase. The ‘Oxford Movement,’ both in name and work, has become a matter of history. In its place we hear of, and are influenced by, the ‘Catholic Revival.’ Yet, it cannot be too often repeated nor too deeply impressed upon all whom it concerns, that, apart from the condition of developement which is essential to a Religious Reformation, the Catholic Revival, both in principle and in practice, is absolutely at one with the Oxford Movement.

But the Oxford Movement is not, at the present time,

coextensive with the Catholic Revival. And it is a striking testimony to the working of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT in the dry bones of Anglican Establishmentarianism, to observe the course of the reinvigorated Movement of late years. In spite of—possibly, in the secret workings of Providence, in order to teach us to lean upon no leaders, Priestly or Episcopal, to trust in no authority short of that of the Church, in consequence of—the defection of its leaders, the Revival has since that time marvellously flourished. The defection, when the widespread drainage Rome-wards had been comparatively checked, left the Party, as an organism, without recognised leaders; and with hardly leading men to lead—with the exception, in those days, of two only, who in different degrees at all could vie with the one eminently great man whom we had lost. The balance, however, again in GOD'S Providence, by the mysterious law of compensation, was more than restored. For the Church self-produced a power which she certainly did not previously possess. She produced a practical working power, which, in nowise remarkable for intellectual strength, theological attainment, or controversial efficiency, possessed an undoubted and undeniable genius for practical hard work in the LORD'S Vineyard.

Hence, perhaps—both from the absence of recognised leaders, and also from the large increase of practical and independent workers—originated that democratic element, which now is certainly another distinctive note of the Catholic Revival, and one that divides it from its earliest phase of the undeveloped Oxford Movement. The last was exclusive, select, almost aristocratic in its sentiments, and at the least class-formed. It was also, from an Episcopal point of view, monarchical. The first is wide, general, unfettered by class, or, if anything, appeals to the

many, instead of to the few. From force of circumstances, it is content to rely upon the Priestly commission, as including all but a single prerogative of the Episcopate, and *that* essential only to the continuance and government, not to the ordinary Sacramental work, of the Church. But the change in the character and practice of the Revival as developed out of the Movement was in part the cause of, and in part was caused by, the change of centre beyond the confined radius of an ancient provincial University to the comparatively boundless circumference of a modern and cosmopolitan capital. London, therefore, of late years has more than occupied the position which Oxford once held. And London, providentially it would seem, has now gained the presence of the one man, of the generation next below the Fathers of the Tractarian Movement, on whose shoulders, of late years, the burden of the Oxford School has almost entirely rested, and who cannot fail to make his great gifts and undeniable power to be felt both amongst his friends and by his opponents.

London has attracted to itself the Oxford Movement, which has hence become developed into the Catholic Revival. It may be affirmed, therefore, considering the changes which have ensued in the course of the development, and over and above its national advantages, that London is not only the best site in which to found the Oratory now contemplated by the Society of the Holy Cross, but that it is the only practicable site on which to begin the work. And here, without being forgetful of the proverb, that he who putteth on his armour boast not himself as he that putteth it off, it may be remarked, that the intention with which an Oratory should be established in London, would be this—that it shall prove a supplementary work to work already existing in this vast city. Anticipation is not realisation; and obstacles the same

in degree, but different in kind, may make shipwreck of this plan, as they have crippled many another and better design. Yet, if the standard be not higher than the height actually to be reached, the average of measurements will fall absolutely short of actual requirements. Hence, while fully acknowledging the work done by other Churches, their chiefs, and their staff of coadjutors—and they are many—to have been emphatically a good, a blessed, and a lasting work, we may, without presumption, express a desire to begin where they leave off, and a wish to be allowed to carry on a prosperous commencement to a successful close.

Other Catholic Churches in London have done, and are doing, noble work for the good of souls and the glory of GOD. But their work is *sui generis*. Its characteristics may be described by the terms, retiring, local, confined, limited. No doubt, by force of circumstances any given Church may have thrown off its *specialité* and from desiring to be unobserved has been the centre of all observation; instead of having local interest only, has become cosmopolitan in its interests and the interests it excites; in the place of being confined in its work, influences England; after having been crippled by a limited supply of helpers, now finds itself overpowered with offers of assistance. London Churches might be named for which one or more of these assertions might be claimed as true—the Church of S. Alban-the-Martyr, Holborn, amongst others. But the Oratory contemplated by the Society of the Holy Cross would voluntarily and deliberately assume a position into which other Churches, in one or more particulars, have been accidentally placed—perhaps against their will. For instance :—They have been forced to work in comparatively out-of-the-way parts of London, where they might be easily overlooked.

We desire to force ourselves into a position of which none can plead ignorance. They have been content to use, specially at the first, with certain noble exceptions, humble buildings for purposes of worship. We propose to possess, eventually, an imposing, and if you please, a pretentious building. They were obliged by a lack of Priest-power, to divide their forces and hence to weaken their efforts; and could offer to the faithful, at certain hours, certain services only—and liberally did they give of their substance, according to their means. We are wishful to concentrate upon one centre a sufficient number of Clergy to allow of a constant and continual succession of Celebrations, Offices, Hours, or Preachings, all day long and every day of the week. They intended to Christianise a parish or district. We aspire, directly or indirectly, to evangelise England. They were constrained to carry on their labours with the help of one or two or more able and earnest fellow-labourers. We desire, by GOD'S Blessing, to attract many men of varied powers, and continually to ensure within the circle of our staff, the services of a really deep Theologian, of a learned Casuist, of an experienced Confessor, of a discreet Director, of an accomplished Musician, of a well-read and practical Ritualist, of an able Preacher, and of a zealous Conductor of Retreats and Missions. Lastly, they were usually intent on securing some one point perfectly developed—be that effort directed to ritual, music, oratory, or awakening of souls. We are determined, GOD willing, to combine goodness, if not perfection, in each branch of our public ministrations; nor shall we feel that we are doing GOD'S work worthily, if we provide not the best of all things attainable for His Divine Service.

Such requirements can only be attained, such results

can only be realised, in London. And the intentions of the founders of the Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross would only be fulfilled when, from small beginnings, perhaps, and gradually, they were enabled to establish in or near a great thoroughfare, a huge modern Church, a Cathedral in its dimensions, more than a Cathedral in the dignity and pomp, in the warmth and fervour, in the reverence and devotion of its Offices. Such a Church, without, should be large enough to challenge attention; within, its functions should be imposing enough to command respect. It should stand in the position to the country, only intensified, which S. Barnabas' once occupied, which All Saints' later filled, which S. Alban's has now had forced upon it. It should be a Church to which 'country cousins' might be referred if they desire to see what the Services of the Church of England were capable of; which country visitors would as naturally seek, once at least during their sojourn in Town, as they now flock to the Royal Academy. Such a Church might at the first be as ugly as may be conceived, in construction; as plain as is meet, or as may be consistent with comeliness, for the worshipper; as rich and beautiful and gorgeous as it is possible, as costly as devotion could command and means afford, in all that concerns the Great OBJECT of Worship within its walls. It might gather together an united band of Brothers, each one of whom would be distinguished for some one special gift or grace. It might offer to all who choose to avail themselves of its spiritual privileges, a constant succession of services—Sacraments, Offices, Litanies, Preachings, Prayer and Praise. Such a Church might eventually become the Mother Church of many Oratories both in London and in other large centres of life and action, such as Liver-

pool, Manchester, Leeds, Bristol, Sheffield, Birmingham, Coventry, or Wolverhampton. It might form a centre round which the faithful in coming troubles from our present connection with, and our future dissolution from, the State could rally. It might seek to be the pattern Church which, without rivalry, all would gladly copy because all would heartily strive to perfect; and it might, if it so please GOD, eventually be made the Memorial Church of the Oxford Movement, and might become the crown and completion and consummation of the Catholic Revival.

III. The proposed site for the Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross.

There is a spiritual desert in this huge city bounded on the north by Oxford Street and Holborn, south by Piccadilly and the Strand, and west by Hyde Park, which, speaking roughly, ends in a point at S. Paul's Cathedral. In this wilderness I know of but a single oasis, one green spot with pasturage, shade, and water—a spot whereon fresh tents are now being pitched, and old tents (it is a matter of congratulation) are now having their cords lengthened, and their stakes increased—the oasis of S. Mary-the-Virgin, Crown Street. On the north of Oxford Street there is, indeed, a chain of Churches, more or less Catholic in character, beginning with S. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, passing on to S. Cyprian, Mary-le-bone; S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square; All Saints', Margaret Street; Christ Church, Albany Street; and ending with S. Alban's, Holborn. This list might have been enlarged, to include the more northerly churches at Kilburn, Hackney, Stoke Newington, and Shoreditch. But enough have been mentioned to show how strong a line of forts, so to say, are in our possession on the north of

Oxford Street; or, to change the simile, how many springs of living water there are which drain, fairly well, the Catholic population, and draw to such centres the faithful whose lot is cast in that district of London. On the south side of the line of which Piccadilly, in general terms, forms the middle portion, and which runs east and west through the southern parts of London, we possess proportionately few centres of operation, or comparatively few religious points of attraction. We have indeed the noble work in Pimlico carried on and extended by worthy successors of the founder : we have S. Mary-le-Strand, a strong and an important bulwark of Catholicism in the south : we have perhaps another church or two. But, as a fact, which it is hard to account for, but cannot be denied, the Catholic centres of action in this part of London lie to the north of the Oxford Street line of thoroughfare. And in that important district which lies between Regent Street and Hyde Park, there exists absolutely no Catholic teaching.

It is, therefore, within these four boundaries, Park Lane, Piccadilly, Regent Street, and Oxford Street, that the Society of the Holy Cross is asked to found an Oratory. This district is selected for two reasons. Firstly, because in itself it is an arid, dry, and desolate region which needs cultivation. Secondly, because it lies midway between two other regions which to a certain extent, though not to so large a degree, need the fertilising influences of our holy Religion to be brought to bear on them—Belgravia and Tyburnia. An Oratory in almost any part of the proposed base of operations would be in the middle of one important area, would be easily accessible from either of the other two. It would be central for a large population of wealth, influence, position, intelligence, and lastly of immortal souls craving for

Spiritual Discipline, Catholic Teaching, and the Bread of Life. It would prove an attractive force to many who share the same blessings in other districts more remote. The remarkable document which took the form of a reply to an appeal for money from the Churchwardens of S. George's, Hanover Square, and which was largely and influentially signed, both at first and afterwards, is a sufficient proof of this prediction. The no less remarkable success of a great and earnest preacher (who it is to be regretted cannot be claimed as an ally) in a small chapel in the parish of S. James, suggests a hope which almost involves a certainty, that good Catholic preaching—to omit higher and more real attractions—would meet with no less a measure of success under the Blessing of GOD.

Neither would the site proposed tend to drain only the districts named, to influence only the classes mentioned. The irregular quadrilateral would be situated within easy reach of the London Clubs; and however little club-life may be thought deserving of consideration, there is no doubt that elements from its vortex would be attracted to the centre which it is intended to found. And this is one other section of society which might be influenced by the proposed Oratory. But there is yet one more. The proposed boundary of operations either includes, or only fails to include, most of the large West-end business or trade establishments with their numerous trains of assistants. Some of these mercantile houses give employment to a large number of persons, both men and women, from which many recruits not only might be, but are already found, to swell the Catholic cause. And the foundation of an Oratory would, without doubt, tend to multiply such numbers.

An opinion long held by others and myself of the

spiritual destitution of the higher orders in London was lately and incidentally confirmed from an unexpected source. At a meeting of Clergy and laity held after the Great Mission of 1869, composed mainly of those who were not, on the whole, in sympathy with or favourable to the Mission, an opinion was repeatedly expressed that however much a Mission was needed to evangelise the Masses, the well-to-do Middle and Upper Classes of this city were even more in need of spiritual arousing, teaching, confirming, and edifying. There have been and there are existing permanent Missions to the poorer millions in the streets of London. Why should there not be a permanent Mission to the Upper-ten-thousand, and to the great Middle Class immediately below the summit of society in the West-end districts? The establishment of the Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross would satisfactorily answer such a question. Only those who have been more directly brought into contact with these classes know how deep is the need of such a permanent Mission, both where such need is felt (which is a wide space), and also (and this is still wider) where such need is felt not at all.

It has been said that one object in view was to establish an Oratory in some leading thoroughfare in London. Such a foundation might be at once impossible, and unwise even if practicable, at the outset. It were better, for many reasons, to begin both in a small way, and in a retired quarter, at first. The example of our Roman brethren who have built a church in a stable-yard is worthy of imitation—in spirit, if not in letter. Possibly some similar site might be found to offer a home for the Oratory of the Holy Cross; and a work begun in a small way, in such a quarter, would soon make its position to be known, and might be suggestive, after a while, to some

person capable of advancing its interests, to provide a more suitable place for its accommodation. Under any circumstances, however, it would be wise for the Society itself to begin operations on a small scale. Such a work must be the work of years. It may not spring mushroom-like in an evening into perfection. The wherefore is not far to seek. It would be necessary for the workers of such a scheme themselves to know each other, and to learn respectively both how to obey as well as how to command, and how to work together in unity as brethren, before they undertook to conduct a Mission on a large scale, to the World without. And the rule which should guide the personal workers, should be the law also for the material portion of their work—a small beginning, which should develope to the greater glory of GOD, into a large and important ending.

IV. The establishment of an Oratory in London which has been thus spoken of in general terms, could only be undertaken by a body of Priests situated as the Brethren of the Society of the Holy Cross. No Society which is not in possession of the strength of numbers, unity of object, diversity of talent, variety of resources, and concentration of power which are possessed by us could hope to attain any such end. But, with GOD'S help, and the co-operation which the establishment of an Oratory could not fail to ensure, what might not a body of between two and three hundred Catholic Priests—in part scattered over the country, and in part concentrated in London, both portions being yearly and rapidly increased in numbers—effect? What results might not such a body of Priests, who, if not all picked men, from a common sense of common danger and in search of a common end, have all been drawn, one by one, to a common centre—if only

they gave themselves to the work—produce? For it is not to be expected, if begun for the greater glory of GOD, and the good of souls, and steadily continued to that end, that the work would not prosper, that the work would not grow. It would naturally by force of circumstances, and supernaturally by the power of Grace, attract to itself men of mark willing to work, and men of power who would gain for the work a name. Men would be called of GOD from different parts of the country to come and join this work in London. And GOD would make them come. They would even be enabled, perhaps would be called of Him, to leave a good work in the provinces to help build up even a better, because a wider, work in the capital. Nor is this surmise a mere conjecture. For it so happened—perhaps I ought to speak less unhesitatingly—that the two earliest applications which I was led to make by letter (after the proposal of the establishment of an Oratory had been accepted as a subject to be considered by the Society) to Priests of mature age and dignified position in the Church, as well as of undeniably great power and ability in the country—who were already doing a good work in their own sphere of labour—were in both cases answered not only sympathetically, but hopefully, and even sanguinely. It is not perhaps too much to affirm, that both Priests were prepared, under certain circumstances, if it so please GOD, to leave their present work, and to join in our labour, if it should be established. And many others, we may be assured, would equally feel the attractive power of such an Oratory, would be equally ready to listen to the call of GOD.

The way in which the Oratory of the Holy Cross might practically be worked, in the event of GOD being pleased to allow of its establishment, would be somewhat after this fashion. The Priests of the Society of the Holy

Cross would be its motive power; both Priests residing at or adjoining the Oratory, and Priests living in their own sphere of parish work, or in their own homes in London. There would be, in the first place, a governing body of three, five, or seven Priests, elected annually, or for two or more years, and presided over by a Head, who would also be elected for a definite term of office. Then, there would be formed a staff—at the outset a small staff—of Clergy attached to the Oratory, which would be gradually strengthened, and which would be responsible in the main for the performance of the Divine Offices. This body of Clergy would undertake the ordinary round of services: and its component parts might conveniently be called the Father, Master, Provost, or Warden, as the case may be, and Brethren of the Oratory. There would also be the other force of Priest-power at work to carry on all Services which were not essential, to fill up, as it were, the outline made by the former body; which force would consist of the members of the Society of the Holy Cross external to the Oratory, either living in, or visiting London. And the form which their extra-ordinary assistance would assume would be that of a cycle of help, each parish Priest, or Priest permanently in London, being responsible in a certain cycle for a certain amount of work. The cycle would be larger or smaller according to the amount of aid which each extern Priest found himself enabled, either by himself or his coadjutors, to afford. But it is probable, from the strength of the Society within the limits of the (national) metropolis, that each Priest would not be called upon more than once in a fortnight for assistance on week-days, and once in a month, or less often, for help on Sundays and Saints' Days: whilst the Seasons of Advent and Lent or other special times might be arranged hereafter, as a matter of detail.

The manner in which 'extern' help might be afforded may be thus described:—The Priest would reach the Clergy-house of the Oratory on the afternoon or evening of the day for which he is responsible for the extra-ordinary Services. He would 'take' the Evensong, or recite the Vesper or Compline Hours (to distinguish between the Anglican Offices and Canonical Hours), as the case may be, the same night. He would also hear confessions, before, between, or after the Services, in his own Confessional; and would be accessible to all who chose to claim his attention either in the Sacristy or the Clergy-house up to a reasonable hour at night. Next morning, he would say Mass at his given hour; he would 'take' Matins or recite the Hours, be present in his Confessional, or be in waiting in the Sacristy; and he would complete his round of duty by saying Sext at mid-day before returning to his own abode. He would thus spend three parts of the day, on the average we have supposed, in direct work at the Oratory once a fortnight.

Could the Brethren of the Society of the Holy Cross, specially those engaged in their own special sphere of work, afford to devote such time and labour to their Oratory? I think that they could. For it must not be forgotten that, thereby and to a certain extent, such Priests would lessen their labours, at least those of a more private sort, at home. When it was known, as it would at once be known, that the Priest, let us say, to take an extreme case, that the Priest of S. Peter-in-the-Docks was due at the Oratory of the Holy Cross, in the quadrilateral above-named, on a certain day, his penitents from the West-end of London could make their confession to him on the evening and receive the Blessed Sacrament from his hands on the morning following: whilst those who were not his penitents, or who might

become so, or who desired his spiritual counsel or advice, might resort to him with less difficulty to themselves and more easily for him, at the Oratory than miles away in the East of London. This is no fancy demand; this is no ideal supply. The want is felt of being able to see Priests who live afar off: and it would be a great boon to many who live in the spiritual deserts of Belgravia and Tyburnia to know that, at a given place and at certain times, Priests whom they desired to consult would always be prepared to be consulted. And this want, by the Establishment of the Oratory of the Holy Cross, would be supplied.

V. We will now consider some of the results which may be attained by the Establishment of an Oratory, by the Society of the Holy Cross.

The regular round of Services which the Oratory could offer to Catholics, of course, would depend to a large extent upon the strength of its staff, and the offer of occasional daily help which it might be enabled to command. The *minimum* of Services which the Oratory should offer, when in the full swing of work, may thus be described:—

Two, three, four, or more daily Celebrations of Mass, one of which should be High Mass, at not less than hourly intervals; with additional Masses, before and after the regular Mass, for strangers, occasional helpers, or residents in London who gave due notice of their intention the day before. The number of Masses would also depend on the form and character of the Oratory. If it were feasible, as it would be most desirable, to build side Altars for Low Mass, the number of Celebrations might be increased, and the succeeding Masses might follow at somewhat shorter intervals, and perhaps for a

few minutes might overlap each other, so that the introductory part of one Mass might be contemporaneous with the ablutions or last Gospel of another. The advantage to 'stranger' Priests of an opportunity to say Mass, by merely giving timely notice, is very great. Practically, it is almost impossible for a country Clergyman to say his Mass either on Sundays or week-days during his stay in town : and the favour granted once by any given Church can seldom be repeated. The hours of such additional Masses might be notified at Evensong of the day before, and published on the Notice-boards within and without the Oratory. The multiplication of Masses would necessitate a corresponding number of Sacristans and Servers and a proportionate supply of Vestments and Altar-Linen: and also—and this is a point of considerable importance, and one strangely overlooked, or unprovided for, by the architect of every modern Church that may be seen in England—a Sacristy of sufficiently roomy dimensions, to prevent unseemly crowding and inconvenience. As a rule our Sacristies are absurdly out of proportion, not only to the strain now placed upon them—which might be an excuse, but to the actual requirements of the chancel and choir, for the use of which they have been planned by the architect—and which hence can afford no excuse for insufficiency. Such oversight might be easily avoided in the Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross. Perhaps two Sacristies, one for Priests and another for the Choir, would tend to ensure order and reverence, and to prevent crowding and confusion.

The mode in which High Mass should be sung in the Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross on Festivals, should be of the highest type known to Catholic Christendom, by which the Holy Sacrifice may be offered according to the use of the Church of England. It should

possess every element in ritual, and music, and other accessories which the tradition of the Church sanctions. It should possess every feature which characterised the beautiful and carefully rendered function in which we had the privilege of joining on the first day of the Synod, in this Church of S. Peter; and which, so far as I have seen, was one of the most perfect forms of Divine Worship England has yet witnessed. You will not, therefore, consider me to be wanting in appreciation for the use of S. Peter's if I name as essentials for the Oratory of the Future, elements which, for some good reason, may have been wanting in this Church. But the founders of the Oratory would not feel satisfied until they restored to the Church of England a rendering of the sacred Mass which was fully mediæval in the correctness of its use, and more than mediæval in the richness, costliness, taste, and perfection of its details. Thus we should desiderate these elements at the least :—The Asperges; the 'Censing of persons and things' or the use of incense in a ritual manner; the correct Introits, Graduals, Offer-tories, Communions; Gospel Lights; Consecration Lights on the Altar and Consecration Candles in front of the Altar, in addition to the Six Altar Candles and two Sacramental Lights; the use of the Altar Bell; the Lavabo; and, of course, the Eucharistic Vestments, for Celebrant, Ministers, Servers, and Acolytes. Into the dangerous arena of Music I will not adventure myself further than to express an opinion that music, more popular, though music of the best composers, might be used in the Oratory, than is sometimes employed in our Churches, for what is in truth, and should ever be made to be, the popular service—the Offering of the Sacrifice: and to this end the aid of orchestral music might be employed to co-operate with the organ; and a large west-

end organ might be made to supplement, or harmonise with, a smaller instrument in the chancel. The erection of a west-end gallery, also, might be made to secure the services of a supplementary choir of mixed voices—an addition to our choral rendering of services which has Continental authority and should not be allowed to escape us from the fact of the practice being either abused in, or connected with our early impressions of, Puritan times. But from an unfortunate ignorance of Music, on this point I will say no more.

Low Mass might be said as plainly, simply, and shortly as is consistent with Catholic use: and to attain the last-named condition, Low Mass might be commenced with the Collect for the day.

Matins might be said plainly, without music.

The forenoon Choir Offices and Hours, specially Sext, might also be said plainly.

The afternoon Hours, Evensong, Vespers, and Compline-song, might be choral. And here again we might, perhaps, with advantage, adopt the custom used abroad with effect, of having some of the Offices sung by men-voices alone, without the aid of boys. Gregorian chants, sung slowly, with voices more or less bass in range, have a grand effect. And such a choir for some, not for all of the Offices, might be obtained by the co-operation of those large centres of business which abound in the West-end, and which are more or less connected with the trade of Linen-drapers and Silk-merciers. For this purpose one of two courses must be adopted. The Oratory must either have the Vesper-song late and Evensong early; or the Vesper-Hours early and Evening Prayer late. The Oratory will desire to minister to two sets of worshippers—the fashionable and less industrious, and the more industrious and mercantile sections of

society. If the staff of Priests were sufficiently large, either Evening Prayer or Vesper-song, or both, might be duplicated daily, at the respectable High Church Vesper hour of five *p.m.*, and the practical Catholic man-of-business hour of eight: whilst Compline might follow at nine *p.m.*, or even later. To accomplish this multiplication of services, however, a double choir would be needful, and two organists, as well as two sets of Clergy.

Litanies, the Stations, and other Penitential Offices, both weekly and throughout the seasons of Lent and Advent might also be said or used. And especially the simple, but most touching and devout Office, the 'Stations of the Cross,' might be said on Fridays both within and without the Lenten season.

In addition to these Services which are more or less regular in their character, the Oratory might provide for special courses of Sermons; popular Conferences; Lectures theological and otherwise; Readings on Holy Scripture; Instructions for different classes and either sex; Classes for men and women, for Confirmation or Communion; Missions for all the world; Retreats for both Clergy and people; and Meetings, Chapters, and Synods for such Religious Societies as the Society of the Holy Cross, its daughter the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, and the English Church Union.

Confessionals should also be erected in the Oratory with the days, hours, and Priest's name in attendance plainly printed on the outside.

And the last requisite I shall name is the great and inestimable blessing, the Reserved Presence on the High Altar, with its ever-burning beacon lamp. This is perhaps the last great need which the Revival still lacks, to complete and perfect the Catholicity of the Oxford Movement. Of course the Reservation will be made on behalf of the

sick. But there is no reason wherefore the whole as well as the sick should not benefit by the fact of Reservation. I mean, not in the way of worship; for this could be denied to none: but in the way of reception. There is no reason why we should not return to the *principle* of absolutely primitive times, and be enabled to communicate when we list—only in Church instead of at home; why we should not adopt the *practice* of the Catholic Church, and be enabled to receive, without hearing Mass—to communicate, without joining in offering the Sacrifice. A short Office, like the one employed abroad, might easily be framed from the Order in use in the West: and many persons would have summarily taken from them the excuse (of which we do not accept the principle) of a long Service preceding reception—the excuse for reception, utterly unknown to Catholic Christendom, otherwise than by fasting from bodily food. Hence, Fasting Communion would become more common, and the lesson learnt in London would, in many cases, be taken away and repeated to others in the country. Reservation, also, would permit of that beautiful complement to Morning Mass being ultimately introduced amongst us, I mean the Evening Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament.

Other questions connected with this portion of the subject demand a passing notice.

The Oratory of the Holy Cross would be the centre of no parish, and consequently would be hampered by no parish work, would be burdened by no parish schools, would be distracted by no parish troubles. The Society numbers too many parish priests among its members to need more than the assertion of these characteristics of the proposed Oratory to ensure acquiescence in their importance.

The form which the Oratory itself (in my idea of its

creation) should assume is that of an ancient basilica Church, adapted to suit modern requirements. Such a form possesses many advantages in our climate, in the locality in which it is to be built, and for the purposes to which we intend to apply it. A basilica, with a deeply incised, flat roof within, would be more easy to make warm in winter, to keep cool in summer, to regulate in temperature and to ventilate at all times, than a Church with a single and pointed roof, built in the Gothic style. It would also allow of a plainer exterior, with the exception, perhaps, of a handsome west front facing the street, in connection with a richer interior, without erecting a building entirely devoid of taste. In the atmosphere and surroundings of London, red brick, either alone, or in combination with black or coloured brick, or stone, or marble, for a material, would be at once appropriate and seemly: and a larger use might be made internally of the same material, in constructional ornament, in window tracery, and even in single or clustered columns and arches, than has yet been attempted in this country. Specimens of this use of brick are to be found in the Churches of North Italy, and the artistic effect is great.

The Altar should be placed in the chord of the apse, which itself should be lengthened eastwards and contain at least three rows of seats sufficient to accommodate a large choir of Priests, choir-men, and boys. The High Altar would thus be within sight of nearly the whole of the worshippers. The ways of approach to and departure from the Altar, which ought to be different, should be wide and roomy. By a disposition of light not difficult to obtain, an East window should be avoided, which it is disagreeable for a congregation to face in the daytime; and its place should be filled with frescoes, mosaics, or mural decorations which will light up effec-

tively at night. The seats, open beneath and with wooden kneelers affixed, where a round of frequent services prevails, should not be moveable. Chairs, though picturesque, are practically laborious in their arrangement: but the seats should not bear a large proportion to the capabilities of the building for holding numbers. The seats and kneelers at S. Alban's, in their proportions of height and width, absolutely and relatively, and in the distance between the several rows, appear to be models of convenience and comfort. It is said that these proportions were adopted after many practical experiments. It need hardly be added that the seats in the Oratory would be free to all comers. Persons should be encouraged, as they are abroad, to stand or kneel only, without support; which in the case of short Offices they can easily, and in the case of popular preachers they willingly do, without fatigue. As it has been indicated, there should be Confessionals on either side of the Church, a western gallery with a large organ, a chancel organ, space behind the High Altar for an orchestra, and side altars, at least one at the extremity of each *quasi*-aisle, and one behind the High Altar, perhaps *dos-à-dos*, and facing west. The High Altar should be furnished with a *baldachino*. A large roomy pulpit, with an hour-glass and a crucifix attached, surmounted by a sounding-board, should be placed one-third down the nave, and seats might be placed opposite to it for the use of the officiating Clergy. Holy Water should be supplied at the entrances of the Oratory, which should be numerous and well protected against draughts. And Sacristies, as has been said, of suitable proportions, and communicating both with the chancel and the clergy-house direct, should not be forgotten. Such are some of the details of construction which might perhaps with advantage be adopted in the Oratory of the Holy Cross;

for many of them we have the practical sanction of Continental Catholicism, though they may be locally unknown to us in England.

The funds for the support of the Oratory if once established, and if built on a sufficiently large scale, would be provided for out of the Offertory. If begun in a temporary building, all moneys received in excess of expenditure might be funded to gather interest for a permanent building. After a permanent building has been completed, they might form the nucleus of an endowment for the Oratory.

A wide field of work might be opened hereafter to such an Oratory as the one proposed, which may here be only indicated—a temporary abode or permanent Home for invalid, over-worked or aged Priests; Schools for the educating and training of choir-boys and men; a Training College for parochial Schoolmasters—a crying need under the pressure of the new national and godless Education Bill; a College in preparation for Holy Orders; Institutions for the relief of the distressed, or for improving the social and material condition of the poor.

A Superior—if such there can be found—to take the lead in such a work must be no ordinary man. He should possess many opposite, though by no means incompatible qualities. He should be blessed with physical power and good health. He should have a capacity for organising and governing; and not be wanting in keenness for details and experience in obedience. A knowledge of music, if not its practice, is needful. A knowledge of human nature, acquired in the Confessional amongst other means, is essential. And a gift of preaching, a mind stored with theology, practical familiarity with ritual, and acquaintance with more than the elements of casuistry, would add much to the influence of the Superior. Lastly, he should

be a Christian gentleman. Where may so much be found in a single Priest? Speaking even to the Society of the Holy Cross I am not ashamed to confess that I cannot tell. Perhaps GOD would raise us up such a man. Perhaps such an one exists already amongst us, though unknown.

The manner in which a scheme, such as I have had the honour to submit for your consideration, should practically be commenced, I am not prepared to describe. Amongst other means which might be adopted for collecting necessary funds, may be mentioned one which would to some extent drain the resources of the country, as well as tend to interest the Church in the provinces. It is this—the organisation of a Preaching Mission to travel through England to make known the proposed establishment of the Oratory of the Holy Cross. In the event, however, of a committee of the Society of the Holy Cross being appointed to consider the question as a whole, this very practical detail would doubtless receive due attention.

VI. Lastly, we must consider the position of the Oratory when established, in the country and in the Church.

It may be asked upon what basis, legal and ecclesiastical, would the Oratory of the Holy Cross be established? The Ecclesiastical position is the only position with which the Society of the Holy Cross need be concerned. But it may be mentioned in passing that, although the Society would not in any way rest its claims to the establishment of the Oratory on a legal basis, yet, as a matter of fact, there exists an Act of Parliament which would prevent the operations of the Society from being legally harassed, or from an Episcopal point of view illegally suppressed, and to which it might appeal for protection. An Act was

passed on the 14th August, 1855, entitled, 'An Act for Securing the Liberty of Religious Worship.' The Act is popularly known as Lord Shaftesbury's Act; legally, as 18 and 19 Victoriae, Cap. 86. Under the directions and through the influence of that nobleman, with the active co-operation of the Bishops, the Act declares it to be 'expedient that the Law affecting Assemblies for Religious Worship should be amended.' The more important portion of the Act is contained in the First Section. By this Section, according to the marginal reading, 'no prosecution (is) to be maintainable for assembling for Religious Worship in a place of Meeting not certified' under certain former Acts. The words of the Section are as follows :—

'1. From and after the passing of this Act, nothing contained in the above-mentioned Acts [1 W. & M. Sess. 1. c. 18, and 52 G. 3. c. 155], or in an Act passed in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Years of the Reign of Her Majesty, Chapter Thirty-six, shall apply to the Congregations or Assemblies hereinafter mentioned, or any of them; that is to say,

- (1) To any Congregation or Assembly for Religious Worship held in any Parish or any Ecclesiastical District, and conducted by the Incumbent, or in case the Incumbent is not resident, by the Curate of such Parish or District, or by any Person authorised by them respectively :
- (2) To any Congregation or Assembly for Religious Worship meeting in a private Dwelling House or on the Premises belonging thereto :
- (3) To any Congregation or Assembly for Religious Worship meeting occasionally in any Building or Buildings not usually appropriated to Purposes of Religious Worship :

And no Person permitting any such Congregation to meet as herein mentioned in any Place occupied by him shall be liable to any Penalty for so doing.'

The Congregations or Assemblies, therefore, to which immunity from a fine for each time of meeting, 'at the discretion of the Justices who shall convict,' of a 'sum not exceeding 20*l.* and not less than 20*s.*,' refers are three-fold, of which the second would meet the case of the proposed Oratory. For instance, Clause Two runs thus—'To any Congregation or Assembly for Religious Worship meeting in a private Dwelling House or *on the Premises belonging thereto.*' Hence, the Society of the Holy Cross is legally at liberty to establish an Oratory for public Divine Worship, provided only it be situated on the premises belonging to a private Clergy-house. The First Clause of the Act provides for the immunity of Assemblies whose worship is conducted by the parish Priest, or by any one authorised by him; but this Clause could only affect the Oratory under circumstances too favourable to contemplate, and which hence need hardly be entertained, *viz.*, securing a site in the quadrilateral above-named in the parochial domain of a friendly Incumbent. The Third Clause provides for the immunity of those who meet for worship occasionally in places not usually appropriated to purposes of worship. It is not difficult for us to see the tendency of these two latter Clauses. The Third gives a licence for Services in Theatres. The First gives a licence for Prayer-meetings in Schoolrooms. Lord Shaftesbury, and his Episcopal supporters, could not have entertained an idea, with respect to Clause Two, that it would have been made use of on behalf of other than mere Protestant assemblages. He could hardly have contemplated, under its provisions, the establishment of an Oratory such as is proposed by the Society of the Holy Cross.

Such, however, is the force of the legal sanction, under the shelter of which, it may be repeated, it is *not* proposed to found an Oratory; but by which it may be possible to claim legal protection for its establishment, on the grounds contemplated in Lord Shaftesbury's Act, in the event, which is highly improbable, of the law being set in motion to interfere with our organisation. It is true, and it is only fair to state, that some persons deny the application of the Act in question to the case before us. They affirm that no Act of Parliament can override Canon Law; that the Act under consideration recognises former laws touching public Divine Worship, and keeps them in force, saving only to the extent to which it distinctly repeals them; and that the Act does not license *persons* to minister, but only legalises *places* in which services may be held, and protects congregations who assemble. The prerogatives of the Bishop, it is added, remain untouched; and his licence for celebrating is still needful. This may be true. But, on the other hand, Civil Law will not permit itself to be set on one side by laws Ecclesiastical. And the question now is one of Civil Law only; and without further evidence, it does not appear that legally any distinction is or can be drawn between the different forms of Religious Worship. Preaching, Prayers, and Celebrations, to different persons, are only various forms of Public Worship; and the Act, whether intentionally or not, and perhaps there was such intention, and so far as legislation can affect the case, distinctly legalises, under certain conditions, all and every form of Religious Worship which those may be pleased to adopt who avail themselves of its sanctions.

The ecclesiastical position of the Oratory, it may be repeated, is the only one which we need consider. And this, it must be owned, is a position of some difficulty

under the present position of affairs, both civil and religious; though it is not a position which, in my judgment, we need shrink from accepting. Before, however, the position to be assumed is discussed, it may be well to mention a plan which has been proposed for adoption to meet the difficulties that are felt towards the scheme which it is my duty to place before you. It is proposed by grave persons, who feel the responsibility of acting without, not to say against, Episcopal authority—it is proposed, if it be possible, to gain the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese for the establishment of an Oratory, before embarking in the undertaking. Without venturing to discuss the probabilities that the present occupant of the see would give his Episcopal sanction to the plan, we will assume that the Bishop consents to our scheme. The Bishop, however, is simply powerless to bind his successors in the see. And it would not be at all an improbable contingency, that the next Bishop of London might withhold the consent which the present Bishop had accorded. In what position would the Oratory then be placed? Supposing we were so far compromised to continuance as to have completed our organism, and to have secured, in brick and mortar, a permanent building in the quadrilateral above-named; supposing the Oratory of the Holy Cross to be a fact and a Church to be erected, at a change of Episcopal authority in what position should we be placed? It may be replied, that sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. I would answer, we must endeavour to foresee, in order to avoid, future contingencies: and it would not be wise, in my opinion, to establish an Oratory on one principle, and to continue it upon another and totally opposite principle. The establishment of the Oratory therefore on the uncertain foundation of a variable quantity, *viz.*, the temporary sanction of the present Bishop, is

not to be commended to the consideration of the Society of the Holy Cross.

But there is another form which this plan may assume, which is indeed only a limited form of the first. Those who would hold to a legal view of the case, modified by a certain amount of ecclesiastical authority, advocate taking advantage, avowedly, of the First Clause of Lord Shaftesbury's Act, and establishing an Oratory in the parish of a sympathising Incumbent. But the same argument which was applied against positively seeking the Bishop's consent, would apply to gaining the assent of the parish Priest. To a like extent only with the Bishop, could the Priest give his consent. He too would be powerless to bind his successor in the living. And the Society's difficulties would only be removed onwards one step, from the present to the future, by the adoption of this plan. And, moreover, though the temper of the present Bishop need not be estimated, it may be safely affirmed that within the proposed quadrilateral limits assigned to the Oratory's position, no parish Priest can be found to give the needful consent. Hence, any plan which would assure to the Oratory a temporary position only of legality in the State, which would secure merely a partial and incomplete recognition by the law, is a plan which, in my judgment, ought to be strongly deprecated. Of course, this difficulty, in either shape in which it has been mentioned, may be overcome. None would more heartily rejoice than myself that the obstacles should be surmounted. But, in such a statement as the present, we must accept facts as they exist. And as the facts of the day meet with us, so must we be prepared to meet our difficulties.

We are therefore reduced to return to first principles. And here it may commend itself to many minds that the present condition in which we find ourselves placed, the

abnormal and disorganised state of the Church, the existing scandalous and vexatious development of the union of Church and State, and the perseveringly and almost innately hostile aspect which our Bishops, as an Order, take to the Catholic Revival, *necessitates* a corresponding, though not identical, course of action on our parts, as Priests in the Church of GOD. If we are looked upon as enemies by the Episcopate, we must act on the defensive. If we are subjected to legalised illegality by the State, we must exercise passive fortitude, and ignore the requirements of judge-made law. If we live in a state of Ecclesiastical chaos in the Church, we must strive to keep as near the centre of the whirlpool as may be, and be affected as little as possible by its eccentric gyrations. In short, Ecclesiastical disorder, State tyranny, and Episcopal antagonism can only be met by Priestly organisation, union, and devotion. We must act, in GOD'S sight, so far as we may in accordance with the spirit of the Canon Law, as Priests of His Church. And the plan I venture to propose for your acceptance is one not unknown, I believe, in certain features of its outline, to Catholic Christendom. My meaning may be expressed in the language of the Act which was intended by its authors to effect a different work in the Church of GOD. For I would wish to see established a 'Congregation for Religious Worship meeting in a private Dwelling-house, or on the premises belonging thereto.' I would establish a 'Dwelling-house' for the members, or for certain members, of the Society of the Holy Cross. I would erect 'on the premises belonging thereto' an Oratory. I would open the doors of such an Oratory to any who chose to enter and therein to form a 'Congregation for Religious Worship.' And I would act thus, not as a rival of the parish Priest, but as a coadjutor to him; not in opposition to the parochial

system, but as supplementing it; not with antagonism to the Bishop, but simply independent, to this extent and to this extent only, of Episcopal supervision. Will any affirm that such a course would be less in accordance with Church law than it is clearly within the boundaries of the law of the land? I think not.

Let us however drop all reference to Acts of Parliament. The Oratory of the Society of the Holy Cross would be the Private Chapel of a Religious Society or Brotherhood which would be open to all who were willing to worship within its walls. Is the foundation of such an Oratory, from a Catholic point of view, illegal, even if devoid of Episcopal countenance? We will confine ourselves to the question of the Bishop's sanction, for the parochial system has utterly broken down in England, not the least signally in London: and therefore the Incumbent's permission in whose parish, supposing him to be unfriendly to the scheme, we had the misfortune to be located, need not be entertained. But as to the Bishop's licence, it is generally admitted that a Religious House may be established, a Chapel may be built, and services may be held for its members, independent of the official sanction of the Bishop. If this be granted as legal in a Church point of view, can it be denied to be legal if the doors of the Oratory remain open instead of closed, if those without may worship in it as well as those within? I cannot think that it may. A College Chapel or a School Chapel are no unmeet comparisons to the proposed Oratory. If Divine Service in these are in accordance with Catholic custom, the custom of the Church cannot be violated by admitting to the spiritual benefits of the proposed Chapel any who care to avail themselves of such privileges. And it is not at all clear that the position of many Religious Houses of old, which were not under

Episcopal authority, would not afford a parallel to our present difficulties, and would, to a certain extent, answer them. For though such Houses were under a different, and sometimes a higher than Episcopal, authority, we may honestly affirm our wish and desire not to be deprived of *some* authority, lacking which we conform ourselves as best we may to the circumstances of the age in which GOD has called us to play a part.

A distinction is sometimes attempted to be drawn between the administration of the Sacraments and the recitation of the Hours, or Preaching, in the Oratory of the future ; and that, apart from Episcopal consent, the last may be lawful, though the first may be illegal. But even if we admit that this distinction, in Canon Law, between preaching and celebrating, which is doubtful, I apprehend that a sufficient answer to this may be found in the thought, that if we voluntarily accept Episcopal authority, we must give to it a ready and docile obedience ; and that if a Bishop objected to Mass ritually celebrated, he would not be likely to welcome Vespers rendered musically, or Evensong with Incense at the Magnificat, or even a Catholic Mission combined with Catholic worship. But a more potent argument would probably weigh with most members of the Society of the Holy Cross. Would they be willing to establish an Oratory simply to say Sext in, or in which to hold a Retreat ? Would they be content with the circumference of the Catholic system, and escape the centre ? We are not anxious to establish a Hall for preaching : we desiderate an Oratory in which to say Mass.

There is one consideration, however, which may be hought to be of force. Although the Oratory as a whole might lack Episcopal sanction, its individual members would each possess jurisdiction accorded by Episcopal

powers. Although the corporation might be without the Bishop's control, each element of the aggregate would be under the Bishop's rule. Of course I speak generally: and it would be wise, perhaps, that those who bear office in the Oratory of the Holy Cross should, as a rule, be likewise situated, as beneficed parish Priests, in the diocese of London. This provision would perhaps tend to remove the objections of some persons. For if Clergy are ordained to act as Priests under a Bishop—and provided always they do not invade parochial rights, a provision which would be enforced—it is a hypercritical reading of jurisdiction to affirm that they have Episcopal authority *e.g.* at Stoke Newington, but that they have it not in the quadrilateral area so often spoken of. I apprehend that, under the conditions proposed for the foundation of the Oratory, as a Private Chapel, and so far as it only is concerned, a Bishop has no power to limit a parish Priest's work to any given Church, or to restrict the habitual jurisdiction he imparts to any given locality within the boundaries of his diocese. Neither has he the power to rule that a Priest may celebrate *e.g.* in the Church of S. Barnabas, but is inhibited from preaching in that of S. Mary Magdalene.

The whole question of jurisdiction and Episcopal obedience, unfortunately, is involved in much confusion by reason of the anomalous position in the Catholic Church in which the Church of England is placed. It is also a question of much difficulty in itself. It is obviously unreal to apply Canon Law absolutely and unbendingly to our condition, when our condition is essentially different, both in outline and detail, from that assumed by Canon Law, and upon which Canon Law legislates. It is unjust to interpret the Canons literally in the case of Priests and figuratively in the case of Bishops. If a hard

and fast line is to be drawn around the ancient Canons, the line must include the Episcopate as well as the Presbyterate. If the line is not to be hard and fast, Priests not only may, but must, benefit by the relaxation. Avowedly, then, we must accept Canon Law on the principles of accommodation. And the view here taken of the question, with much diffidence, is this—that habitual jurisdiction is given by CHRIST to all Priests at their ordination, *absolutely*, to be exercised over any one who willingly submits himself to the same. The actual jurisdiction of the parish Priest is not hereby invaded, first, because, though locally within his parish, the Oratory is a Private Chapel; and secondly, because those who frequent it either are not his parishioners, or are not *pro tanto* his parishioners. And if it be objected that such *imperium in imperio* is unknown, or hostile, to the spirit of the Canons of the ancient Church, it may be replied that, by analogy in this instance, and directly in the case of another Sacrament, we of the Anglican Communion are distinctly compromised to this principle. For, the Church of England recognises the habitual jurisdiction of her Priesthood, absolutely, when exercised over any one who willingly submits himself to the same—in the case of the Sacrament of Absolution.

What, then, it may be asked, would be the position of the Oratory of the Holy Cross? I answer—It would be the *Private Chapel of a Religious Society*, from the Offices and Services of which no Catholic who desired to participate would be excluded. It would be the Private Chapel of a Society which not only asserts no local jurisdiction in the parish in which it is founded, but distinctly disclaims such jurisdiction. It would be an Oratory for Priests of the Church who claim authority over, and obedience from, those only who worship within its walls,

and who voluntarily yield the obedience and authority which is claimed. On this position we should take our stand ; and for our authority, until the conditions both of Church and State, with which we find ourselves involved, are simplified, we appeal to the inherent rights of the Priesthood, to our own acquired powers in Ordination, to an Episcopate better advised, and to the Church of the future, less hardly tyrannised over by the State, and more free to exercise the authority given to her by CHRIST Himself. And I earnestly hope that the Society of the Holy Cross may decide—supposing such course to be compatible with Catholic consent, as under the circumstances it may be considered to be—not to seek, at all events at the first, Episcopal sanction, nor to look for Episcopal support. For myself, I believe that any other course would be a grievous, a fatal mistake, which would make shipwreck of the whole plan. I have the greatest possible respect for the Office which Bishops hold, which is compatible with half a lifetime of evidence of the way in which many individual members of the Order systematically degrade the Office, to suit their own personal ends, to favour their own peculiar opinions, or to further their own private judgment.* It is impossible to affirm

* Since these words were written the fearful sacrilege which has taken to itself the only too true designation of the 'Westminster Abbey Scandal' has been perpetrated. A more wilful and heartless desecration of the most Holy Eucharist, whether the celebrant or the recipient be considered, can hardly be imagined. Nothing comparable to it for wickedness has happened since the commencement of the Catholic Revival. The indifferentism of the Georgian era, the lawlessness of the Rebellion, the darkness of the Reformation, afford, so far as I know, no parallel to the sacrilege. The only parallel in intention, not in deed, which history calls to mind, is to be found in the closing events in the life of Arius. But the parallel is in many points one of antagonism, not of similarity. Communion is not commanded to be given to an heresiarch by a

of the Order, as at present State-appointed, as now constituted, and from a Catholic point of view, that its

heathen Emperor ; Communion to a teacher of deadly heresy is extenuated, apologised, defended, applauded, by Christian Bishops. Communion is not denied by a Catholic Bishop, with a prayer that he might be taken to his rest rather than behold such evil ; Communion is administered by a Clergyman after special and nominal invitation. It is no conscientious waverer, no victim torn by doubts, no mere disciple with hereditary drawings away from the truth, who is communicated ; but it is an apostate from the religion of his fathers, a preacher and minister of the untruth, one who has published to the world his disbelief in almost the entire Catholic Faith—it is such an one who is invited to GOD'S Altar by a high dignitary, and who is congratulated upon being so invited by the heads of the Church. With the unhappy person who was the instrument of the Scandal we have nothing to do. To his own Master he standeth or falleth. But with the Priest who invited him and with the Bishops who rejoiced and gloried in the invitation we have, alas ! a great deal to do. It is more than probable that the Canon Law, if it contemplated such sacrilege, would declare the Priest to be *ipso facto* excommunicate—one with whom his fellow-priests could not communicate, to whom they dare not give Holy Communion until he repented—it is more than probable, since for an offence infinitely below the gravity of the sacrilege in question, *viz.* communion in prayer only, excommunication was pronounced according to the Apostolic Canons. To the same extent as the Bishops, who communicated with the agent of the Scandal, were conscious of his presence at the time of Communion, or defended his invitation and reception afterwards, are they placed in a similar position in the eyes of the Church. It is the policy of the Church paper which circulates in the most influential quarters, and which, so far as my memory serves me, has never been known to take the highest line in any crucial question which has arisen—it is the policy of the *Guardian*, having indiscreetly eulogised the 'Scandal' at the outset, as a 'happy augury,' to withdraw behind the defences of respectable orthodoxy (but without boldly retracting its first utterances), and to patronise the signatories and protestors, to advise them to let well alone and to do nothing further. But, if I mistake not, the matter cannot, in any Christian sense, rest where it is. The Scandal is too grave ; the actors too seriously compromise the

ordination vows are respected. To an Order, therefore, which deliberately violates, whether conscientiously or not, the terms upon which it possesses any claims to obedience, it is equally impossible to render that obedience which our own ordination vows contemplate. An Order whose 'admonitions' and whose 'judgments' are not 'godly,' how is it possible to 'obey reverently,' and to follow with 'a glad mind and will'? As Catholic Priests who believe in, were ordained into, and reverence the Church, this is beyond the bounds of possibility. It becomes a question which of the two are to be obeyed—GOD, in the person of His Church, or man, under the aspect of a chief Shepherd. I do not think that I at all overstate, and I certainly do not willingly overstate the case, against our spiritual Fathers. For I appeal to

Church; the wickedness is too great. The Church by representation, however feebly and partially Convocation represents the Priesthood, ought to free itself from all complicity in the outrage upon the Blessed Sacrament; and to declare that it is very far indeed from holding, with its Prolocutor, that it would be a 'graceful thing'—a *graceful thing* to pass a vote of thanks to the Dean of Westminster for desecrating the Altar of which he ought to be the jealous keeper. The question is too important for summary disposal; and there are issues from it the consequences of which we have yet to learn. And it seems reasonable for me to draw the attention of the Society of the Holy Cross to the matter, which so aptly and so miserably illustrates the opinion expressed in the passage to which these words are appended as a foot-note. It is due to the Archbishop of Canterbury to bear in mind that he has distinctly condemned the occurrence, though in the guarded language of the following words:—'I cannot understand any one feeling it right to invite to our Communion Service a teacher of the Unitarian body.' This expression of the Archbishop's opinion, with characteristic *suppressio veri*, was omitted in the summary of the Primate's letter in the *Pall Mall Gazette*. If it was not right to invite an Unitarian Minister, it was wrong. If it was wrong, in so serious a matter it was *sin*.

members of the Society of the Holy Cross to declare whether or not the Catholic Revival has not, as a whole, prospered (aye, marvellously prospered), not by reason of Episcopal support, but in direct opposition to almost every single Bishop who has unfortunately come athwart its Divine course. And if we descend from generalities to particulars, I can ask, with confidence as to your reply, what special and particular developement in doctrine, or in ritual, or in discipline, have, not one Bishop, nor two Bishops, but have not many Bishops actively and even energetically opposed? So far as I know, when the developement has been made in a Catholic direction, not one. Suffer me then, once more, earnestly to exhort the Society of the Holy Cross, in the establishment of an Oratory in London, to rely on the inherent powers alone of an ordained Priesthood which, in GOD'S Providence, has carried the Catholic Revival from its origin to its present point of developement ; and not to rely upon uncertain, fickle, and hesitating support (the most we can hope for) at the hands of almost any member of an Episcopal body which corporately has in vain attempted to stem the tide of advancing Catholicity.

The six points which I desired to lay before you have now been discussed with as much fulness as the question, in its present preliminary stage, permitted. There are, however, other points upon which I wish to secure your attention before deciding whether or not the scheme proposed may claim further consideration from the Society of the Holy Cross.

The Oratory which I have attempted to picture would possess two characteristics which have never yet been combined in any single place of worship to which we have had access. It would be free from the tyranny of

the State. It would be independent of Episcopal interference. Let me say a few words under each of these heads.

1. I shall assume, what must be only too painfully conscious to us all, and what most of us are more acquainted with than myself, familiarity with the present anomalous, immoral, and anti-Christian Union which exists between Church and State. I may assume also that, as a Society, we are at one in our wish to see such an Union dissolved. I wish it might be further assumed that we are all mentally resolved to do all that we may to hasten Disestablishment. But assent to the facts of the case is enough for my purpose; and to assent that the Oratory of the Holy Cross would be free from State tyranny is sufficient to bind us together in united action. Such freedom would shelter us from the vexatious, contradictory, anti-legal decisions of judge-made law, whether delivered in the Court of Final Appeal, to which no Catholic adheres; or in the lower Courts, which not only are not constituted according to ancient precedent, but also allow of appeal to the higher lay Courts, and to which, therefore, no Catholic ought, in consistency, to give countenance.

2. In the rapidly approaching prospect of Disestablishment—a prospect, however, which may not, though it probably will, be realised in our lifetime—it would be a fact beyond comparison important that an Oratory could be presented to the eyes of the nation, free from the tyranny of the State and independent of Episcopal interference, which yet should consistently and conscientiously submit to authority—the authority, namely, of the Catholic Church. Such a sight would do more to educate Catho-

lics in general to the point of declaring for Disestablishment, than perhaps any other means of teaching popular opinion. But, then, one and all, so far as it is possible with the present phase of Society, must agree to be bound by authority. We must not accept Catholic custom in one point, and reject it another. We must not teach high doctrine, and practise lax discipline. We must not assert stern discipline, and encourage 'moderation' in doctrine. We must not adopt the highest ritual in conjunction with discipline, and doctrine which is not comparable to it. The application of the Vincentian rule for doctrine to all essential points both of discipline and of ritual, and to accept in non-essentials what the West has practised, and what the East sanctions where the West is silent, would seem to cover all needful points of possible difference. Especially in two points would it be essential to present an unbroken front to the enemy, if we would repulse the attacks which are sure to be made upon our apparent withdrawal from all authority and our actual independence of visible authority—one in either subject indicated. We must be unanimous, I firmly believe, in our adherence to the Catholic use, from the fasting Celebration of the Last Supper to the present day, of ourselves celebrating, or of communicating others, fasting from earthly food. And we must be decided, I also venture to think, in adhering to the ancient Catholic Ritual which prevails at this moment in the great Western Patriarchate of which we still actually, though outwardly and unjustly severed, form an integral portion. No doubt an elaborate and symbolical Use might be framed by tessellating into our Order a square from the Ambrosian Office, a triangle from the Mozarabic Missal, a circle from the Sarum Use, or polygons from the Eastern Rites: but the mosaic would be wanting in harmony, the ritual would be only a

fancy ritual, the Office would become eclectic. The English Use, however imperfect, mutilated, transposed, supplemented, is a living branch of a living tree. It may be grafted from vital sources which still possess authority. It cannot be impregnated by crystallised forms of life, however beautiful, ancient, or edifying.

In conclusion, I would only ask leave to say two things.

Firstly—That I have done little more than elaborate some details of a plan which, in one form or another, I have for years mentally considered.*

Secondly—That I believe a great and noble work is offered to the Society of the Holy Cross for its acceptance—not in the words of this paper, but in the facts which these words describe; not by the writer of the paper, but by GOD, in Whose permissive Will these facts have their origin. Persons are widely, are loudly, have been for long, crying for some such centre of action as I have attempted to depict. I plead not for the literal adoption of the ideas here imperfectly placed on record. But I do earnestly plead for the adoption of some plan which may include some of these ideas. The Society of the Holy Cross possesses unusual facilities for the origination of, as well as unusual power to continue, such a work. It may almost be assumed to have a direct call from GOD, and will incur grave responsibility before GOD, if it dis-

* I may perhaps be allowed to refer to an Essay in the Third Series of *The Church and the World*, 1868, which discusses, with the writer's usual felicity, some points raised in this paper. It is entitled 'Missions and Preaching Orders,' and is from the pen of the Rev. J. E. Vaux.

regard such call. I pray GOD the Society may not only think that the subject deserves its counsels, efforts, and prayers, but that the question demands its active support and its practical origination. The Society would merit the blessing of the future Church, as it would insure the gratitude of all living Catholics if it consented to establish in London an Oratory of the Holy Cross.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWÖODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET

0001 72

59766

252N

Sh64

Shipley, Orby

The four cardinal virtues,
considered in relation to the
public life of Catholics.

252N

Sh64

59766

